THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

VOL. CXLII, No. 1 JANUARY, 1960

CONTENTS

Is the Baltimore Catechism Outmoded? *Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.* 1

A Fourth Century Textbook on the Trinity *L. J. Daly, S.J.* 10

Why a Sister Shortage? *Sister Mary Emil, I.H.M.* 22

The Sacramental Character as the Key to Understanding Christian Life *J. Richard Quinn* 32

Tower of David *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 41

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS
John P. McCormick, S.S., and Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.

Lenten Mass and Office 50

Black Zuchetto 50

Mass Server's Communion 51

Et Incarnatus Est 52

Varia 52

The Obligation to Denounce Violations of the Sacramental Seal 53

Moral Problems Connected with Television 54

(*Contents Continued on Next Page*)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington 17, D. C.

Copyright 1960 by The Catholic University of America Press.

(Contents continued from previous page)

BOOK REVIEWS

The First Jesuit, *by Mary Purcell* 60

Elementary Patrology, *by Aloys Dirksen, C.PP.S.* 61

Planning for the Formation of Sisters, *edited by Sister Ritamary, C.H.M.* 62

Liturgical Retreat, *by Roy J. Howard, S.J.* 64

Studia in Honorem Francisci Roberti, J. B. Montini, H. J. Cicognani : S.R.E. Cardinalium 65

Freedom of Choice in Education, *by Virgil C. Blum, S.J.* 65

The Spiritans. A History of the Congregation of the Holy Ghost, *by Henry J. Koren, C.S.Sp.* 68

The Scope and Nature of University Education, *by Cardinal Newman* 69

BOOKS RECEIVED 71

BIBLE LANDS IN BEAUTIFUL COLOR

I Color Slides by Jerusalem Pontifical Biblical Institute.

Set		Subjects	Slides
W	Jerusalem, Way of the Cross	45	$18.00
J	Jerusalem, Sion, Olivet	60	24.00
B	Bethlehem, Juda, Samaria	50	20.00
AS	Archaeology, Old Testament	50	20.00
AN	Archaeology, New Testament	50	20.00

12 other excellent slide sets. Send for catalog.

Produced and Distributed by MATSON PHOTO SERVICE

II. Matson Color Slides and Filmstrips

	Subjects	Slides	Filmstrips
The Life of Our Lord	52	$13.00	$7.00
The 23rd Psalm	14	3.50	3.50
Blue Galilee	13	3.50	3.00
Petra	20	5.00	4.00
Geography of Palestine	50	12.50	6.50

FREE—with each slide set or filmstrip—MANUAL giving descriptions and Bible quotations.

Write for free descriptive folders listing hundreds of subjects — Bible lands' scenes, sacred art, etc.

THE MATSON PHOTO SERVICE

1282-E So. Highland Ave. Los Angeles 19, Calif.

Reprinted by Popular Demand—

HUMAN EVOLUTION 1956

With APPENDIX

The Present Catholic Attitude Towards Evolution

By J. FRANKLIN EWING, S.J., Ph.D.

A Reprint from the Oct. 1956 Issue of

ANTHROPOLOGICAL QUARTERLY

Father Ewing is Professor of Physical Anthropology at Fordham. This authoritative article should be of particular interest to *all Catholic Students and Educators.*

52 pages, 5 figures

Single copy.....$1.00 Postpaid
In lots of 5..... .90 each

ANTHROPOLOGICAL QUARTERLY

The Catholic University of America Press
Washington 17, D.C.

IS THE BALTIMORE CATECHISM OUTMODED?

The Baltimore Catechism first appeared in print in April, 1885, as the result of an enactment by the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, deputing a committee of Bishops to draw up a catechism for use in elementary religious instruction throughout the United States. The reason for this enactment was the fact that many different catechisms were then in use throughout the country (some of them not well suited to the intelligence of children), so that pupils who were transferred from one diocese to another, or even from one school to another within the same diocese, were likely to be confronted with an entirely different catechism text. Hence, the Bishops commanded that one standard catechism be issued by the committee, which could then be used throughout the land, and even translated into other languages for the children of German and French families.[1]

It is a tribute to the Bishops of the committee, and especially to Bishop John L. Spalding of Peoria, that within six months after the conclusion of the Council the first edition of the Catechism appeared. Much credit is due also to Monsignor De Concilio, pastor of St. Michael's Church, Jersey City, who co-operated with Bishop Spalding.[2]

For more than fifty years this Catechism was used in the parochial schools and Sunday schools of the United States, in the same form in which it was issued, as the basic text of religious instruction. It was known as Baltimore Catechism, No. 2, to distinguish it from the briefer and simpler Catechism No. 1, and the amplified form known as Catechism No. 3. I do not hesitate to say that the great majority of Catholics above thirty years of age in the United States today used the original Baltimore Catechism as the text for their first religious instructions.

However, even shortly after its appearance, the Catechism became the subject of some adverse criticism. This is not surprising in view of the assertion (well authenticated, it would seem) that the pub-

[1] *Acta et Decreta Concilii Balt. III* (Murphy, Baltimore, 1886), n. 219.

[2] Cf. Connell, "The Forthcoming Revision of the Baltimore Catechism," *Bulletin of the National Catholic Educational Association*, 1940, pp. 546 ff.

lished work was really intended only as a trial draft, so that the authors were completely surprised when, through some strange misunderstanding, it was presented to the public as a completed text.[3] However, it was only in 1935 that the work of revising the Baltimore Catechism was definitely undertaken under the supervision of the Episcopal Committee on Christian Doctrine of the NCWC, composed of Archbishop John McNicholas of Cincinnati, Archbishop John Murray of St. Paul, and Bishop Edwin O'Hara of Great Falls (later Archbishop-Bishop of Kansas City). Extraordinary effort was devoted toward producing a catechism that would be most effective for the religious instruction of the youth of our land. More than two hundred persons co-operated in the production of this revision—theologians, priests engaged in the active ministry, teaching brothers and sisters, and members of the laity. Four preliminary drafts appeared, one after the other, privately printed, to be submitted to the workers for renewed examination and correction. The third draft was sent to Rome for the inspection of the catechetical department of the Sacred Congregation of the Council and was returned with only a few corrections. Finally, on July 18, 1941, after six years of work by the collaborators, the fifth and final draft of the revised Baltimore Catechism No. 2 was made public. This is the edition that is in use today, though some corrections have subsequently been made.

Thus, the statement that non-Catholics in good faith belong to the "soul of the Church" was eliminated in 1943, as a result of the teaching of Pope Pius XII in *Mystici corporis*.[4] Of course, the concessions of the same Sovereign Pontiff in the matter of the eucharistic fast have also been incorporated, and an appendix quotes the rules of ecclesiastical fast and abstinence now commonly accepted by the Bishops of the United States.

After the publication of the Baltimore Catechism, No. 2, three other catechisms were issued. The smallest, the First Communion Catechism, containing fifty-four questions, is intended for children in the first and second grades. Catechism No. 1, containing 214 questions, is suited to the pupils of the third, fourth and fifth grades. The answers to these questions, for the greater part, are shorter

[3] Cf. M. Moesslein, "The Baltimore Catechism," *AER*, XCIII, 6 (December, 1935), 613.

[4] NCWC translation, n. 64.

than those contained in Catechism No. 2. This last is intended for grades six, seven, and eight. It contains 499 questions, with an appendix of sixteen questions, constituting a brief apologetics course entitled: "Why I Am a Catholic."

Several years after Catechism No. 2 had been published, an advanced catechism, No. 3, was issued, to supplement the former and to adapt it to the needs of more advanced students. This was due mainly to the scholarship and zeal of the late Archbishop McNicholas. It contains the same questions and answers that are found in Catechism No. 2, but most of the answers are considerably augmented by scriptural texts and a wide field of information on liturgical, doctrinal and devotional matters. This is intended for students in high school and even in college. As is evident, particular circumstances would warrant changes in the adaptation of these catechisms to the different school grades, since some younger children might be able to use the texts intended for the higher grades, while some of the older pupils might still need the more elementary texts.

The chief objective in this revision of the Baltimore Catechism was to attain thoroughness, accuracy and clearness in the presentation of Catholic truth. Every word and phrase was carefully scrutinized, with a view to choosing the most exact and most simple mode of expression; and the fact that practically no criticisms have been brought against the catechism on this score for the nineteen years of its existence would seem to indicate that in this respect it has been successful. At the same time, no human work is perfect; and the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, under whose auspices the catechism is published, is always prepared to modify the text in response to any suggestions that would definitely improve the content or the mode of presentation found in the present text.

To evalute properly the Baltimore Catechism No. 2, as also the First Communion Catechism and Catechism No. 1, one must bear in mind that these little books are not intended to give a complete explanation of the doctrines they present. They give merely an outline of religious truth. The remainder must be filled in by the teacher. On the back cover of these publications it is stated: "The Episcopal Committee of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, in these catechisms, presents a *textus,* not a *cursus.*" Only a competent teacher can use these catechisms effectively. But a good teacher,

using these catechisms as the basis of her instructions, is able to give a thorough, interesting and inspiring course in Catholic truth, fully adjusted to the needs of the pupils, according to their school grades.

Catechism No. 3 is intended to serve as a manual of instruction. For, it is believed that the average student in high school can profitably study this book and derive from it a truly scientific and thorough knowledge of Catholic teaching, just as he can profit from the study of manuals of history or chemistry. This is true, even in respect to the fundamental work known as *This We Believe: By This We Live,* comprising four hundred pages. It is still more realized in works which amplify the basic Catechism No. 3, such as the Confraternity Edition, which contains also a summary of the truths taught in each lesson, as well as a series of study exercises, such as column selections, problems and "true and false tests."

However, in recent times some dissatisfaction has been expressed regarding the value of the Baltimore Catechism as a text for religious instruction. The chief proponent of the objections is Fr. Johannes Hofinger, S.J., of Manila, Philippine Islands, particularly in his book *The Art of Teaching Christian Doctrine.*[5] He has also written a series of articles on the same theme in *The Catholic School Journal,* January-April, 1955. He is definitely convinced that the Baltimore Catechism contains some basic errors, not in orthodoxy, but in its manner of approach and its mode of presentation. He ascribes similar defects to other catechisms, which have been widely used in the past, especially the Deharbe Catechism, which was quite popular in our country some years ago as a complement of the Baltimore Catechism No. 2.

I am not sure how familiar Father Hofinger is with the Baltimore Catechism or with catechetical writings that have appeared in this country. Certainly, he has a puzzling statement to the effect that "it [Baltimore Catechism No. 2] entitles the third main section 'God's Gifts' and adds a fourth on the Sacrifice of the Mass."[6] Now, the fact is that the official Catechism entitles the third section "The Sacraments and Prayer" and has not a fourth section on the Mass. Father Maguire, in a supplementary work,

[5] J. Hofinger, S.J., *The Art of Teaching Christian Doctrine* (U. of Notre Dame Press, 1957).

[6] *Ibid.,* 73.

adopts this division. Furthermore, Father Hofinger states that the Baltimore Catechism in its original form was based on Deharbe's Catechism, and one of his statements (if not the main argument) is that it followed the arrangement of Deharbe—the Creed, the Commandments, and the Sacraments. Father Hofinger is evidently unaware that the original Baltimore Catechism had the order: Creed, Sacraments, Commandments. It was only in 1941 that the present order was adopted—at a time when, according to Father Hofinger, the best catechists were accepting what we then rejected. Moreover, Dom Augustine Walsh, an outstanding catechist in our land, after an investigation to find some link between the Baltimore Catechism and previous works of the same character, admitted that he could not find any particular one which served as the basis of the Baltimore Catechism.[7]

Certainly, the bibliography given by Father Hofinger in his book seems to indicate little familiarity with the numerous works on catechetics which have been produced in the United States. He gives seventy-three titles, of which fifty-five are in German, French or Latin. Of the remaining eighteen, in English, eight are by Father Hofinger himself or by Father Jungmann, S.J., whose ardent disciple Fr. Hofinger professes to be. He does not seem to have paid much attention to Baltimore Catechism No. 3, nor to the (at least) thirty catechetical works based on the Baltimore Catechism with a view to explain its teaching more fully and to provide help for those who use it as a text. In view of his concentration on works that are in accord with his own ideas, it is not surprising that Father Hofinger does not hesitate to assert that the system he advocates "is now recognized by modern catechists as being the most satisfactory and appropriate."[8] And, without regard to those who might hold opposite views, he tells us that the writings of Father Jungmann have demonstratd convincingly that our catechetical methods in previous decades were sadly defective and that "our teaching of the faith, both in catechetics and in sermons, does not sufficiently stress what is essential and central in Christian doctrine."[9] And so, he calls for a very radical change in view of what he regards as a widespread and tragic defect, and which can be remedied by the methods

[7] F. Walsh, "The Baltimore Catechism," *AER*, XCV, 3 (Sept. 1936), 279.
[8] J. Hofinger, S.J., *The Art of Teaching Christian Doctrine*, 77.
[9] *Ibid.*, 4.

advocated by Father Jungmann and himself. One of his suggestions, which should be brought to the attention of those interested in our Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, is that there should be no catechism used as a text in the early classes of the grade schools. "No catechism in the early grades of the grammar school" he tells us is one of the first and most fundamental principles of the movement he is promoting. He would substitute narrative by the teacher.[10] In regard to what has been considered an approved procedure in our land with the catechizing of young children he says: "Children were generally required to learn these unchildlike catechisms by heart, word for word. We do not need to say that the result in many cases was mere mechanical memorizing of abstract texts, the meaning of which was often grasped in part, or perhaps not at all, and that these memorized texts offered the well-meaning but helpless child next to no nourishment for his religious life."[11] I would strongly challenge this statement. A good teacher, using the Baltimore Catechism as a text, can succeed in having her pupils memorize the answers and have a good understanding of them also.

Father Hofinger believes that the only successful method to teach catechism is what he calls the *kerygmatic* method. This means that "the mystery of Christ" must be the underlying theme of instruction. The good tidings of our salvation in Christ must be taught in such a manner that all our doctrines are understood in relation to the mystery of Christ. Thus, the doctrine of grace can be understood properly only when it is presented as our unmerited share in the mystery of the Word Incarnate, the Church can be properly understood only as the Mystical Body in which the divine life brought to us from heaven by Christ is to be developed and perfected, the sacraments can be presented properly only as the gifts of God whereby we are brought into the mystery of Christ in the most living and effective way. Finally, the new divine life which Christ gives us demands of us a new way of life, which is to be found in the observance of the Commandments.

The proper presentation of the mystery of Christ, Father Hofinger believes, requires a change in the order of topics in the catechism. He believes that the treatment of the sacraments as well

[10] *Ibid.*, 41.
[11] *Ibid.*, 2.

as of the creed should precede the explanation of the commandments. In fact, he holds, the doctrine of the sacraments should not form a special section, but should be fused into the various articles of the creed—for example, Holy Orders in connection with the Church, Confirmation in connection with the article on the Holy Ghost. The treatment of the commandments should come last, he asserts, because otherwise the joyousness of the Christian message is not properly emphasized. For, he believes, "every attempt to present and organize Christan teaching as the realization of our life's task will always necessarily lead to an 'obligation-structure' and not to a 'value-structure'. . . It is simply unbearable that our glad tidings should end in a mere listing of Christian obligations! In genuine Christian, therefore unadulterated 'evangelical' proclamation of doctrine, the joyous message, hence the 'values' must under all circumstances have absolute precedence."[12]

What is to be said of Father Hofinger's theory? I believe that many of the points he brings out, such as the need of presenting Christian Doctrine as "good tidings," are excellent. But I do not believe that his arguments are sufficiently cogent to demand the rejection of the Baltimore Catechism. As to the *kerygmatic* approach, the presentation of the mystery of Christ in a way that will emphasize its significance in the Christian religion, good teachers, using the Baltimore Catechism as a text, have been employing this method all along, even though they did not use the word *kerygmatic*. A review of a revised Challoner Catechism (the equivalent of the Baltimore Catechism in England) which appeared lately in *The Sower,* the English catechetical periodical, expresses the mind of the reviewer respecting the changes advocated by Fr. Hofinger (without mentioning his name) and could appropriately be applied to the Baltimore Catechism:

> You may think, if you are very up-to-date, that our old Challoner-redolent catechism and this latest refurbishing of it, fails to effect unification of doctrine into one centralized, well-articulated Mystery, and didactically is still too scholastic and analytical, neglecting the Bible-history and liturgical-mystical aspects of the Mystery. (We are quoting imaginary reviewers of it from imaginary catechetical reviews abroad.) Still, after all, Challoner managed to utter the good news somehow; I

[12] *Catholic School Journal,* April, 1955, 120.

still don't believe the Mystery is just a matter of re-arranging a syllabus, or using this or that new key-phrase. In any case you couldn't possibly get everything into one small book; and behind this book there is (one hopes) a teacher, and behind the teacher several aid-books, not exclusively scholastic and apologetic in their outlook. So, pending the arrival of something better, we are sure our *Abbreviated Catechism with Explanations* could convey some spark of the Message to our young teen-ager of today.[13]

One of the expressions in this review requires the explanation that the exponents of the new kerygmatic movement believe that in the traditional catechisms after Trent there was more of the apologetic and scholastic approach than is commendable today. Personally, I believe that this assertion can be debated. Surely, in our land, at least an elementary training in apologetics is required for all Catholics and a scholastic approach to religious truth is by no means something to be rejected, provided it is adapted to the mentality of children.

As to the order of presentation, it is difficult to see why it is so vitally important to have the sacraments precede the commandments. Why is it so derogatory to the Christian message to let the pupils know that they have certain obligations before they have learned other portions of divine revelation? Indeed, to use Father Hofinger's own argument, if the commandments are likely to offset the joyous features of the message, why not put them in the middle, so that they will be sugar-coated, so to say, by the second part of the gladsome tidings? In any event, a good teacher should be able to propose the commandments as elements of the joyous message, as happy means of showing love in return for God's love. Did not Our Lord tell us that His yoke is sweet and His burden light?

It would be a serious risk to abandon a text that has proved its merits for more than seventy years, providing millions of American Catholics with the basis of a sound religious education. In the educational field, especially, radical changes should not be made hastily. Certainly, if in the course of years the proposed new method demonstrates its superiority in lands where it has been used, then by all means it should be introduced into America. But up to the present it surely has not given sufficient proof of its

[13] *The Sower* (London), July 1959, 86.

superiority to justify such a revolutionary modification of our methods. The catechism and the catechetical methods of the United States have no reason to be held up unfavorably in comparison with those of other lands. It would be a sad mistake if we allowed ourselves to be dominated by an inferiority complex when a method from abroad is proposed in place of our own on the ground that we have been doing inferior work in the catechetical field for many years.

No more suitable quotation could close this article than the statement of Fr. Aloysius Heeg, S.J., a catechist of superior excellence and long experience. He says:

> Right now we are hearing a great deal about new catechisms and new plans for teaching religion that are being prepared outside of the United States. These new catechisms and plans have much to commend them, and for this we should be truly grateful. Catechists of America are not so well satisfied with their own work that they do not welcome help from others. However, we should not forget the great contribution made to the teaching of religion in the United States by the Episcopal Committee of the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine in undertaking and carrying to a successful conclusion the revision of the Baltimore Catechism. . . . Good pedagogic textbooks based on the Revised Baltimore Catechism do more than inform; they inspire and motivate. They are not content with getting pupils to recite what the Catechism says. They do all they can to get the pupils to understand, love and live what the Catechism contains. . . . In exactness, clearness and completeness the Baltimore Catechism really excels. It would be difficult to find another catechism superior or even equal to it.[14]

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

[14] *Our Parish Confraternity* (Washington, D. C.), February 1959, p. 1 ff.

A FOURTH CENTURY TEXTBOOK ON THE TRINITY

It was the year of grace 355. Using a bit of historical imagination, we can watch the Emperor Constantius as he glances through a set of imperial despatches. Now Constantius was an emperor with Arianizing ideas and he had already begun successfully to dominate the situation. The future looked anything but rosy for the orthodox faith. Most of the great bishoprics of the Eastern Empire were in the hands of Arians or Semi-Arians. Athanasius was about to be banished again, indeed this had almost become routine procedure for him by this time. Constantius (337-361) had already been partially successful with his policy of intimidation in the West. For example, at the Council of Arles in 353, when the Frankish bishops expressed their desire to adhere to the definitions of Nicea, they were handed an imperial formulary which threatened with immediate exile anyone who would not condemn the bishop Athanasius. It was the West's first experience with Caesaropapism. Unfortunately, it was not to be the last. At the council at Milan, four courageous bishops stood by the faith of their Fathers only to be hailed into a private imperial audience where the emperor (according to Athanasius) exclaimed: "My will is Canon Law. . . . Obey me or exile!"

It was this same emperor, Constantius, who found himself reading the following words:

> Blessed Augustus, I implore you not with words but with tears that you no longer permit the Catholic Church to be outraged. . . . It is not right that anyone should forcibly constrain men to submit to masters who everywhere sow the impure germs of adulterous doctrine.

Recognizing a possible allusion to himself as one of the "sowers of adulterous doctrine," the emperor was not happy. The writer of this letter was certainly laughing in the face of danger, and that laughter came from a certain Hilary of Poitiers. Hilary had but recently been elected bishop of what to the Eastern mind was the comparatively backwoods diocese of Poitiers in France. Doubtless, the emperor had his staff consult the imperial equivalent of our *Who's Who* to discover something about this upstart bishop. His

Who's Who was probably much better than ours, for we know too few of the biographical details of Hilary's life.[1]

Hilary had been chosen bishop by popular acclaim somewhat like Ambrose at Milan. Apparently he had been converted to Catholicism from paganism, for in the first chapter of the *De Trinitate* he tells us that, considering paganism, he reached the conclusion that there must be One God; then, coming upon the Old Testament he saw and understood the Jewish revelation; finally, upon reading the Gospel of St. John, he was led to the full truth. It has also been said that, before his election, Hilary had been married and had a daughter, Abra, by name. Indeed, a letter has come down to us addressed to Abra. But in all this there is still room for doubt. Of his baptism we know that it occurred when he was an adult, a further indication of a conversion from paganism. We do not know the exact date of his election to the bishopric, but a probable date is 350.

After his elevation to the bishopric, Hilary busied himself with the instruction of the flock committed to his care and wrote his *Commentary upon St. Matthew,* which had great influence because of the great scarcity of such works in the western division of the Roman Empire. By the early 350's the Arians had begun to disturb the ecclesiastical peace of France. As has been noted they were successful at the Council of Arles, and the machinations of Saturninus effected a condemnation of Athanasius. Hilary was disturbed. Although he was not familiar with the intricacies of the quarrel or the developing dogmatic distinctions, he firmly believed in the traditional dogma and fought against the new teaching. Such was the strength of his convictions that he wrote the letter quoted above to Constantius. After that, events moved more quickly.

Saturninus and two others, Ursacius and Valens, summoned a council at Beziers. Hilary attended but nothing was accomplished for, as Hilary is said to have remarked, "those people would have tried to deceive Christ Himself." Soon after came a decree which

[1] In drawing up these brief biographical notes on Hilary the following have been found most helpful: Le Bachelet, "Hilaire (Saint) evêque de Poitiers," *Dictionnaire de la théologie catholique,* vi, cols. 2388-2462 (1920); ed. Fliche-Martin, *Histoire de L'Église,* iii (1936); Mourret-Thompson, *History of the Catholic Church,* II; Duchesne, *Early History of the Christian Church,* II; Bardenhewer, O., *Patrology;* Tixeront, J., *Histoire des dogmes,* ii.

banished Hilary from his diocese. The bishop went into banishment to Phrygia for three years (356-359).

By one of those sequences in which Christians see the Providence of God, this banishment of Hilary, brought about by the Arians, really caused their own doctrinal downfall in the West. For Hilary went to the important centres of the East and there gathered up all the loose threads of the Arian controversy. There he obtained clear information about the Nicene Council held thirty years before. Then, when his exile was over, he returned to the West. But he did not come back empty handed, for he brought with him the manuscripts of his two great works, the *De Synodis* (a history of the many and varied councils in the East since Nicaea so that the Westerners could understand what had happened), and his treatise *De Trinitate* (a Catholic textbook and defense of the traditional doctrine). The *De Trinitate* brought France into line and aided a great deal in making the West secure against the heresy. When Arianism came again with the barbarian invaders more than a half century later, it was recognized for what it really was by the Catholic hierarchy. For his work in the struggle against doctrinal error, Duchesne has called Hilary the Athanasius of the West.

Before taking up the textbook similarities of the *De Trinitate,* it is well to recall the situation at the time. Arianism was at its height during the years 350-361. It was at this time that the emperor placed his services at the command of heresy, that Pope Liberius fell afoul of imperial violence and his own distinctions, that Hilary and Athanasius were banished, that councils Rimini in the West and Seleucia in the East compromised with Arianism. Of this last event Jerome remarked: "the world awoke to find itself Arian." From 361-363, Julian the Apostate, hating Christianity, tried to turn the clock back to paganism. He hated Christianity and though he recalled all exiled bishops, Catholic or Arian alike, he promoted dissension in the various dioceses. However, with his death the situation begins to change. From 363-379 emperors waver between orthodoxy and various lighter shades of heresy, and at the Council of Constantinople (381), doctrinally speaking, the candles were put out on both Arianism and Semi-Arianism.

In order, however, to understand better the value of Hilary's book, some presentation of Arian and Semi-Arian arguments

should be made. An Arian apologist might argue with Hilary in the following fashion.[2]

"Let us consider the facts. Even our weakest argument, drawn from the 'Fathers' is interesting. In the *Shepherd* of Hermas, which is surely a work written before 150 A.D., the writer does not clearly teach a Trinity of any sort, but confuses Jesus Christ and the Holy Ghost. To quote from one of your own future dogmatic historians: 'In his system the Holy Ghost has assumed a body.' St. Ignatius in his Letters (and again I quote) 'seems to ascribe the divine sonship to the fact that Mary conceived by the operation of the Holy Ghost.' The *Didache* or *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles* is a good example of an early catechism—but where do you find any definition of the Trinity? The writer calls Christ a 'Child of God,' but surely that is true of all of us. Even Origen says that, though eternally begotten, the Son is inferior to the Father, not possessing the fullness of the Father; I think you will see how logical our conclusion is (on Origen's own premises) that the Son is not Infinite God. Tertullian, too, remarks that the Father is the whole substance of which the Son is a part.

"You ask what is our opinion of the Council of Nicea. As we see it, the emperor Constantine was present, with his soldiers, and Athanasius railroaded through that 'consubstantial-with-the-Father' clause, which many bishops did not clearly understand. Consider the synods and councils during the past forty years, and the quarrels about the meaning of that term. You will remember Paul of Samosata and his use of the term 'consubstantial' which the Council of Antioch condemned.

"But let us take up our Scriptures, for after all we both believe in Revelation. We see no need to create a great problem, no need to go against everything philosophy and reason teach us, no need to demand that we believe Three Persons in One God unless Revelation says we must. Let us see what Revelation does say. You Catholics draw many of your arguments from the Gospel according to St. John, yet John tells us that Christ addressed the Father and said: 'This is eternal life that they may know thee, the *only true God* and him who thou has sent, Jesus Christ.' Therefore, the Father is the only true God, but you admit the Son is not the

[2] There is a very excellent summary of Arian arguments in St. Thomas *Contra Gentes,* IV, chapters 1-26, but especially 5-9.

Father, and so the Son cannot be God. Again John quotes Christ (*John* 14:28): 'You would rejoice that I am going to the Father, for the Father is greater than I'; and Paul adds: 'And when all things are made subject to him, the Son himself will also be made subject to him' (*I Cor.* 15:28). This clearly shows the Father is greater than the Son, but if they were one in essence this would not be so. Therefore, they are not one in essence. Again, John says (*John* 5:19): 'Amen, I say to you the Son can do nothing of himself.' But such a need cannot be predicated of a divine being; hence, Christ is not divine. Besides to obey, to be sent and commanded are things which cannot be true of God. Again, John quotes Christ as saying: 'I do as the Father commanded me,' and Paul remarks that he was 'Obedient unto death.' Therefore Christ cannot be God as the Father is. We do not allow that distinction of yours about the divine and human nature; because, after all, that is the precise point we are disputing: whether he had the Divine Nature!

"Furthermore, the Apostle Paul says that God raised Jesus from the dead (*Rom.* 8:11), and Peter remarks that Christ was 'exalted by the right hand of God'; therefore he was a creature, although of course the most exalted creature. Indeed, Jesus himself admitted that 'to sit on my right or left hand is not mine to give you but to them for whom it was prepared by my Father' (*Matt.* 2023); and also he confessed of the end of the world, 'but of that day or hour no man knoweth neither the angels in heaven, nor the Son, but the Father.' Now this is a point of fact which the Infinite God must know, and Christ Himself admits he does not know it. In the Old Testament the inspired writer (24th book of *Eccles.*) says of Wisdom (which clearly refers to the Son): 'I came out of the mouth of the Most High, the firstborn before all creatures,' and he continues, 'then the creator of all things commanded and said to me and he that made me rested in my tabernacle.' Next, the writer adds, to show the clear reference to the Son: 'From the beginning and before the world was I created, and unto the world to come I shall not cease to be, and in the holy dwelling place have I ministered to him.'

"Thus you see the Old Testament also clearly points out to us that the Son is not of the same nature as the Father. Finally, Christ said, when praying to the Father on that last night before he died, 'that they may be one as we also are one.' Certainly he did not want his apostles to be one in essence, and so we would not con-

clude that He and the Father are of one essence. Incidentally, you will recall that in *Job* (38:4), when speaking of creatures, the writer says: 'when the morning stars praised me and all the sons of God made a joyful melody. . . .' We can see from this that the scriptural term, 'Son of God,' proves nothing.

"To sum up my argument. What contradicts all we know from reason about personality and essence, what is clearly against the revelation of Sacred Scripture, what the early Fathers certainly did not clearly hold, this must not now be called a matter of Faith."

From the above summary of an Arian's position, the difficulties which Hilary had to face from a purely dogmatic point of view (leaving aside the political machinations of the Arians and Semi-Arians) were not easy.

PROFESSOR HILARY REPLIES

In book I, Hilary outlines his own progress in the way of Truth and then briefly describes the order of his book, remarking that he has tried to follow an order adapted to the reader's progress. Book II is for the catechumens, while book III gives a more profound treatment. The succeeding books (IV-XII) take up various arguments of the adversaries, and develop Hilary's own arguments further, as step by step he relentlessly pursues his foes. In the first book (from #21 to #36), Hilary gives his own very lengthy synopsis and explanation of the plan of his work, and he proves himself possessed of clear pedagogical principles. (The order chosen for this essay follows rather the order of a typical modern manual of theology on the Trinity in order to show how much of it can be found in its fourth century predecessor.)[3]

That God is one, Hilary stresses frequently because the Arians made so much of this point; however, he remarks that of those who believed in God, nobody ever dared to raise any doubts about it. But, he adds, we cannot deny that the Son of God is God simply

[3] The *De Trinitate* is contained in volume X of Migne's *Patrologia Latina*, cols. 26-472. The text is that of Dom Coustant, a Benedictine scholar of the seventeenth century, and a more critical text is needed. The present essay was written because there is now at hand a complete English translation to which student and professor can have ready access: *Saint Hilary of Poitiers, The Trinity*, translated by Stephen McKenna, C.SS.R. (New York: Fathers of the Church, Inc., 1954). Translations cited are from this translation.

because there is only One God. That there are three *persons,* really distinct and each really God, he proves with special emphasis on the formula for Baptism (*Matt.* 28:19):

> For what is there pertaining to the mystery of man's salvation that it does not contain? Or is there anything that is omitted or obscure? . . . It includes the meaning of the words, the efficacy of the actions, the order of procedure, and the concept of nature.
>
> He commanded them to baptize in the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, that is, in the confession of the Origin, the Only-begotten, and the Gift. There is one source of all. God the Father is one from whom are all things; and our Lord Jesus Christ is one through whom are all things; and the Holy Spirit is one, the Gift in all things. Everything is arranged, therefore, according to its power and merits. There is one Power from whom all things are, one Offspring through whom are all things, and one Gift of perfect hope. Nor will anything be found wanting to a perfection so great within which there is found in the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit: infinity in the Eternal, the form in the Image, and the use in the Gift.[4]
>
> The Son is from that Father who is, the only-begotten from the unbegotten, the offspring from the parent, the living one from the living one. As the Father has life in Himself, so the Son has been given life in Himself. The perfect one from the perfect one, because the whole one from the whole one. There is no division or dissection, because the fullness of the Godhead is in the Son. The incomprehensible one from the incomprehensible one, for only they themselves know each other mutually. The invisible one from the invisible one, because He is the image of the invisible God and because He who sees the Son sees also the Father. One is from the other because they are the Father and the Son. The nature of the Godhead is not different in one and in the other, because both are one. God is from God, the one only-begotten God is from the one unbegotten God. There are not two gods, but one from one. There are not two unbegotten gods, because He is born from Him who is unborn. The one is from the other and is not different in anything because the life of the living one is in the living one.[5]

It is true that Hilary does not write much about the Holy Ghost. Of the more than four hundred and seventy columns of the work in Migne's *Patrologia,* only about three refer to the Holy Ghost.

[4] McKenna, *op. cit.,* II, 1, p. 35. The place in the Migne edition will henceforth be given in parenthesis with the Roman numeral and column number, i.e. (X, 50), is *Patrologia Latina,* X, column 50.

[5] McKenna, *op. cit.,* II, 11, p. 45 (X, 59).

But they are sufficient to make clear the orthodoxy of Hilary. At the end of his description of the plan of his work he remarks:

> Therefore, it seemed logical that, after rejecting the name of creation from our faith in the only-begotten God, we should also teach those things which are also suitable and reverential in our profession of faith concerning the Holy Spirit, in order that those who had been already strengthened by the long and careful discussions of the earlier Books might not be wanting in a complete knowledge of our entire creed, since, after the heretical and erroneous teachings concerning the Holy Spirit had been eliminated, the mystery of the Trinity, through which we are reborn, remained unharmed and undefiled within the saving definition by the authority of the Apostles and Gospels. Certainly, no one would dare any longer to follow the views of human reason and place the Holy Spirit in the ranks of creatures whom we would receive as a pledge of immortality and for a share in the divine and indestructible nature.[6]

In Book II (#29), further proofs are offered from Scripture, and Hilary uses *Galat.* 4.6; *Ephes.* 4:30; *I Cor.* 2:12; *Rom.* 8:9. He is not anxious to write of the Holy Ghost, but "we cannot remain silent because of those who do not know Him."

But Hilary is far more concerned with proving the Divinity of the Son before and after the Incarnation. He marshalls proofs by decades. For him the great point is to establish the *fact;* let the analogies work out as best they may. He quotes the proofs from St. John especially, and in a whole series of passages in the second Book, verging from the sarcastic to the sublime, Hilary puts before his reader many arguments, ironically pointing out how this poor fisherman, "unknown, unlearned, a fishing line in his hands," possessed a Wisdom which transcends all the worldly wise ("Shall I consult the scholars of Greece?"). He adduces the testimony of the Gospels, the Epistles of Paul, and the writings of the Fathers. He points out that the confession of St. Peter certainly referred to more than a mere "sonship" because it required a special revelation. His terminology usually speaks of "one in nature" but nevertheless "two, Father and Son, equally God." The word "person" he uses very rarely in the *De Trinitate;* however, when he does use it, he speaks of one in nature, three in persons. (The word *essence* in the *Trinity* is also very rare, although this is not true of his work *De Synodis*).

[6] *Idem,* I, 36, p. 32 (X, 48).

When he turns to the Old Testament, Hilary has recourse to the theophanies and has long arguments drawn from them, and, of course, he uses the verse from *Genesis:* "Let us make man to our image." Jacob, Abraham, Moses, all these contribute what seem to him very clear indications and references to the Trinity in the Law and the Prophets. In all this Hilary is but following the customary interpretation of the other biblical scholars and writers of his own time.[7]

That the Trinity is a mystery in the most absolute sense of the term is very clear from Hilary's pages. There occurs passage after passage of reverential complaint about how little we can know of the mystery, but he encourages the theologian: "Even though I know that you will never reach your goal, I will congratulate you for having gone ahead, for whoever seeks after infinite things with a pious mind, although he never overtakes them, will still advance by pressing forward." He emphasizes that we cannot measure God by our own little intellects, like his adversaries who "measured the omnipotent nature of God by the weakness of their own nature." One must remember that Hilary was disputing with the Arians and Semi-Arians, who were quite facile dialecticians, but whose fundamental difficulty was a failure even to suspect an analogy of being in the use of such words as "sonship," "generation" and "nativity." Consequently, he underlines the weakness of the human mind to know anything of the Trinity without the aid of revelation: "If no one knows the Father except the Son, it is certainly wise to believe Him Who is the *only sure* witness."

St. Hilary constantly refers to the Father as unbegotten, who alone does not proceed; but that the Son proceeds through generation is reiterated many times *(unigenitus ab ingenito)*. As to what is meant by this "generation," he cautions us not to ask, for this is above the human mind:

> And if someone perhaps will blame his own understanding for being unable to grasp the mystery of this birth, since both the Father and the Son are clearly known, he will learn with even greater sorrow that I am ignorant of it. I do not know, I do not seek, and still I am at peace. The Archangels have not fathomed it, the Angels have not heard it, the Generations have not grasped it, the Prophet has not preached it,

---

[7] *Idem*, e.g., IV, 17, p. 106 (X, 110); IV, 27, p. 115 (X, 117).

the Apostle did not ask about it, and the Son did not reveal it. Let the mournful laments cease.[8]

He writes that one cannot compare this to human generation, although he notes the comparison with fire. When he speaks of the Word *(Verbum)*, he does not draw out the analogy so familiar to modern students of the Trinity:[9]

These things, as I have stated, are only brought in for the sake of comparison, in order to impart to us a knowledge of the faith, and not as things suitable to the dignity of God, in order that we may the more easily derive our understanding of invisible things from those that are material; not, indeed, that any comparison does adequate justice to the nature of God, since it is fitting and just to believe God when He testifies regarding Himself.[10]

Since Bishop Hilary wrote so little about the Holy Ghost, it is not surprising that his remarks on the procession are brief. He frequently repeats that it is only due to the heretics that he is forced to the very threshold of the unknowable, as far as our reason is concerned. He states that the Holy Ghost is from Father and Son, but what this procession is he does not think it well to speculate about, although he proves from *John* 16 that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and receives from the Son:

Concerning the Holy Spirit . . . it is not necessary, however, to speak about Him in whom we must believe together with the Father and the Son who begot Him. Indeed, in my opinion there should not be any discussion about whether He is. He is, since as a matter of fact He is given, accepted, and obtained, and He, whom in our profession we must join with the Father and the Son, cannot be separated in such a profession from the Father and the Son.[11]

Just as from the fact that Your Only-begotten was born from You, all ambiguity in language and difficulty in understanding are at an end and only one thing remains, that He was born; so, too, in my consciousness I hold fast to the fact that your Holy Spirit is from You, although I do not grasp it with my understanding. I am dull in your spiritual things. . . .

I was baptized in the Father, Son, and the Holy Spirit, namely, that I may adore You, our Father, and Your Son together with You, and

---

[8] *Idem*, II, 9, p. 43 (X, 58); III, 3, p. 66 (X, 77); VII, 11, p. 234 (X, 208).
[9] *Idem*, VII, 11, p. 234 (X, 208).
[10] *Idem*, VII, 30, p. 258 (X, 225).
[11] *Idem*, II, 29, p. 57 (X, 69 ff.).

that I may gain the favor of Your Holy Spirit who is from You through the Only-begotten.[12]

It has been said that the theory of the Relations is in *De Trinitate* but not explicitly, either because Hilary did not wish to raise this issue in the dispute, or because he did not know them as such. The phrase *"quia invicem sunt"* is perhaps as close as he gets to the actual expression of the theory. In effect he says that the whole distinction of the Son from the Father consists in that He is the Son *(Neque aliter potuit aut debuit Filius a Patre distingui quam ut et natus esse, nec tamen differens doceretur)*.[13] As regards the distinction between the Divine Persons and the Divine Essence, Hilary simply repeats the statement that the Persons are inseparable and that the Plenitude of the Divinity is in the Son:

God is invisible, ineffable, infinite. In speaking of Him, even speech is silent; the mind becomes weary in trying to fathom Him; the understanding is limited in comprehending Him. He possesses, indeed, as we have said, the name of His nature in the Father, but He is only the Father. He does not receive His Fatherhood in a human way from anywhere else. He Himself is unborn, eternal, and always possesses in Himself what He is. He is known to the Son alone, because no one knows the Father except the Son and he to whom the Son wills to reveal it, nor does anyone know the Son except the Father. Between them there is a mutual knowledge and again between them there is perfect cognition. And, because no one knows the Father, except the Son, let us keep before our mind the Father together with the Son who reveals Him and who alone is a reliable witness.[14]

Of the *notiones,* Hilary does all but name *"paternitas"* and the same can be said for *filiatio.* Circumincession he states clearly enough:

Whatever is in the Father is also in the Son; whatever is in the unbegotten is also in the only-begotten, one from the other and both are one in substance, not one person, but one is in the other because there is nothing different in either of them. . . .[15]

---

[12] *Idem,* XII, 56, p. 542, 57, p. 543 (X, 470 ff.).

[13] *Idem,* VII, 20, p. 246 (X, 215); VII, 31, p. 259 (X, 226). Cf. also the disputed fragment given in Migne, *P.L.,* X, 726.

[14] McKenna, *op. cit.,* II, 6, p. 40 (X, 55-56).

[15] *Idem,* III, 4, p. 67 (X, 78). Cf. also VI, 19, p. 187 (X, 171); IX, 48, p. 370 (X, 319).

This is but a brief outline of what can be found in this fourth century textbook. Incidentally, it should be mentioned that Hilary answers all the various objections of the Arians as given above, except of course the argument from "the Fathers" which only a more modern theologian would have been likely to use and which was here cited to show the difficulty confronting Hilary. His method was to establish a conclusive proof from absolutely clear texts about the Divinity of the Son, and, on the basis of this conclusion, reconcile the alleged texts by showing that Christ was speaking of his human nature or that the interpretation taken by the adversary was not the only possible one. Hilary was mainly interested in proving beyond the shadow of a doubt that *there is a Trinity* and that the Son is God, coequal and eternal with the Father. He piles proof upon proof until the weary reader says, "You win." Explanations or analogies are incidental; the *fact* is the important thing. We have God's word for the mystery, what more do we need: "I pledge myself not to a futile contest of words, but the persevering profession of an unquestioning faith."[16]

When Hilary died (sometime between 366-369), he would have been consoled to know that France would remain orthodox in the Faith. His book had done its work. The Arian barbarian invaders were not yet in sight, but when they did come their creed was recognized and avoided by the conquered Catholic populations. That France in her history has sometimes been a difficult daughter of the Church cannot be blamed on Hilary; but he is one of those great workers who can lay claim to have brought it about that she is one of the oldest.

L. J. Daly, S.J.

St. Louis University
St. Louis, Missouri

[16] These are almost the concluding words of the treatise. *Idem*, XII, 56, p. 543 (X, 471).

WHY A SISTER SHORTAGE?

The Sister shortage is not an academic problem in the sense that any of us can discuss it lightly. For all Catholics it is very much a question of souls—the souls of those children who are now being denied admission to Catholic schools and who may be turned away in the future in still greater numbers; the souls of the youngsters who are not being reached and who will not be reached through the Confraternity of Christian Doctrine, and all because there do not seem to be enough laborers for this white harvest.

It is a problem of great concern to the laity, the clergy, and to the Sisterhoods themselves. Communities have been organized especially for the practice of the spiritual works of mercy, but they now find that, although the works of mercy are waiting to be done in schools that are already built, and for children whose parents are clamoring for Catholic education in a Catholic school, there is, for some reason, a shortage of teaching Sisters. The communities do not seem to be able to multiply as fast as is needed.

Certainly we cannot believe that the Lord of the Harvest is unaware of or unconcerned with the needs, and so it is not unfitting that the Sisterhoods should ask, not how they can raise up Sisters out of stone, but what obstacles we may be placing to the realization of God's plans, or what co-operation we may be withholding. What follows is a summary of the thoughts formulated by those in the Sister Formation Conference, and a report on what they envision as an aid to this pastoral apostolate.

Actually there is no Sister shortage by way of an absolute decrease nor by way of an alarming falling-off of vocations of the kind which occurred in parts of Canada and in Europe after the war. There has been a good and a steady growth in most of our communities and the *teaching* Sisters have increased from 77,000 in 1945 to 95,000 in 1958. This means that when deaths and retirements are subtracted from the yearly increments through new vocations, our communities are growing at the rate of 1.75% a year. This tidy little increase would be satisfactory enough were it not that while we grew from 77,000 Sisters in 1945 to 95,000 thirteen years later, the combined elementary and high school Catholic population grew from 2,500,000 children to 4,300,000

children (in round numbers). And a still sadder statistic, while we were growing to 95,000 Sisters, the *total* pool of Catholic children of elementary and secondary school ages grew from nearly 8,000,000 to over 10,000,000; and in four years from now, this group will exceed 12,000,000.

In terms of even present pupil-teacher load, which is too high, this would mean that for us to put every Catholic child in Catholic school, with an all-Sister staff, would require 290,000 teaching Sisters for the elementary and high schools alone. And that, it seems, is the full extent of the Sister shortage on this level: nearly 200,000 too few.

Let us talk about lay teachers. The decision to use lay teachers in parochial or diocesan elementary and high schools is, of course, not one that the Sisterhoods can or should make. The decision as to how she will practice distributive justice in allocating the Sisters she has at her disposal is one for the major religious superior to make, and often she tries to express this in terms involving a ratio of Sisters to lay teachers—something which I believe personally to be a less desirable formula.[1] But even when it is put like this, the major superior is not making a decision about any particular school, but is giving a suggestion, friendly and apostolic, about what might be done to adjust to the fact that there are not enough Sisters, and that there will not be enough of them in the future that we can forsee.

As a result, while the Sisters engaged in teaching grew from 77,000 to 95,000, lay teachers grew in number from 8,000 to 35,000. To put it in another way, while our numbers increased at the rate of 1.75% a year, theirs increased at the rate of 11.22% a year. Furthermore, a scientific projection made by Sister Rose Matthew[2] and widely quoted and publicized of late, concluded that if the Sisterhoods continue to grow at the present rate, and if lay

[1] Some basis for a just distribution, of course, is required. It might be urged that a Sister-enrollment ratio would afford a fairer basis for a comparison of the number of Sisters allocated to parish and diocesan schools. Such a ratio—assuming an upper limit to the number of students to be handled by one teacher, in justice to the children, and in consideration of the mental and physical health of the Sisters—would leave with the parish or diocese the decision as to how the gap in available teachers would be filled.

[2] All the school-enrollment and Sister-population statistics given here are taken from Sister Rose Matthew's study, one which we believe worthy of the

teachers continue to increase at the present rate; and if we continue to take only the present proportion of our Catholic children into our schools—in other words, if nothing changes but the population—by 1971 we should have 137,000 lay teachers and 121,000 Sisters.

It is greatly to be feared, of course, that something else will change in addition to the population. There is serious likelihood that in view of the difficulties of Catholic school finance, we shall take a smaller and smaller proportion of our Catholic children into our Catholic schools. This may take place, in spite of the fact that Catholic schools now enjoy a seller's market, that they have been growing much faster, proportionately, than public schools, and that parents seem eager as never before to get their children into our institutions at almost any cost.

This would be a tragic missing of a great opportunity for the growth and strengthening of the Church if we let it happen, but if it does not occur, it will only be because all of us who are concerned with Catholic education have replaced hand-to-mouth planning with educational statesmanship.

It might be repeated: the staffing of our schools with lay teachers was not the Sisters' program. It is an action that is forced upon as as soon as a diocese, or even some dioceses in the country, permit the building of classrooms for which there is not an assured supply of prepared Sisters. The higher superiors have understood the need of lay teachers, but the Sisters in the ranks have not always done so, and have not been too eager, always, to accept them. Experience has shown, however, that whenever a Sister audience *does* understand that the extension of the Church's teaching mission depends upon our agumenting our ranks with these teachers, they do react favorably even to the prospect of the sacrifices which will be involved in taking in these new co-laborers. That the parish Sisters have not always understood the inevitability of the acceptance of lay teachers is perhaps due to the fact that we have not done a good job of informing them. They have not understood the

---

most serious kind of analysis by all in any way concerned with planning for Catholic schools, elementary, secondary, or collegiate. This study is published on pages 85-216 of this work: Sister Rose Matthew, *Planning for the Formation of Sisters* (New York: Fordham University Press, 1958).

population trends, for instance. We have encouraged them to think in terms of a passing crisis or emergency, when in fact we are confronted with a continuing and predictable situation. We have not helped them to analyze the picture from a diocesan rather than a parochial point of view, or even from the standpoint of the good of the entire Mystical Body rather than that of one diocese. When the Sisters all understand this, however, they will all welcome the lay teacher.

Meanwhile, however, we would perhaps all do well to bear in mind that the greatest difficulty about lay teachers may not be the matter of finding them and paying for them. If we are to continue thinking in terms of a Catholic educational system whose backbone is the contributed services of religious teachers, we should perhaps consider seriously whether it will be sufficiently clear to young girls in these schools of tomorrow in which we will have so many young, well-trained, attractive lay teachers, just why they are needed *as Sisters*. Unless it is very obvious how much more the Sister precisely as Sister can and does do in these schools, and unless we prepare Sisters (as the Holy Father has explicitly asked us to do) who are superior to their secular colleagues, we may find that while the contemplative orders and the secular institutes will grow, the apostolic religious orders will decline.

It is well known, certainly, that there is a truly alarming dearth of vocations to the nursing communities, and that the vocations which do come do not take rise in the hospitals and nursing schools. Possibly one reason for this is that in this age, when our hospital Sisters have been snowed under incredible heaps of paper and other administrative work, it has not been clear to the apostolic-minded young woman how much more she can do as a Sister nurse than as a lay nurse. In outfitting our hospital Sisters with highly technical professional skills, we did not take the time to give them the general culture and the apostolic formation which would now enable them to exert a wide and manifest spiritual influence in their institutions, and we are reaping the fruit of that in a vocation decline. The example does not have complete parity, but we can agree that from the standpoint of vocations alone (to say nothing of the influence they can exercise), we cannot afford to minimize the importance of the life and work of the religious. If this be truly the age of the lay apostle, as it surely is, then the religious are required to be "super-apostles,"

who can train the lay apostle; they must be women of great competence and greater spirituality.

If we want Sisters like this, we have to *form* them; and this brings us to Sister formation, to which a great deal of thought and planning has recently been devoted. To some this may appear as a prime cause of the Sister shortage. It is true, of course, that the program proposes *lengthening* the preservice training program for Sisters; this amounts to about two years beyond the novitiate. Since the Church forbids the employment of novices for the sake of the works of the Institute, the real cost of the Sister formation program is this two years of what is called "juniorate." The juniorate is much more than a period of completing college. Thirty-seven States now require a Bachelor's degree for the first permanent teacher's certificate, and an increasing number are requiring it for the very first assignment to a classroom.

Last year 86% of all beginning public school teachers met their first class after full degree training. The movement to accredit even elementary schools gathers momentum, and we are beginning to run into instances of Catholic schools losing accreditation (with appropriate fanfare in the secular press), or even being threatened with revocation of the license to teach at all, because of faulty teacher preparation. The college work is necessary, therefore, primarily in justice to the children, and secondarily because we cannot afford to expose and jeopardize Catholic education; but this is the least part of the Sister formation program. The most important part is a deepened and lengthened spiritual formation, which will involve daily instructions and will be spread out over a five-year period.

The Sisters in our Catholic schools tomorrow will have bigger responsibilities, more dealings with parents and lay teachers, multiplied and more serious distractions, greater opportunities in the training of lay apostles. And in all of this immersion in the tasks of the world, they must remain secluded from the world. While they think out and develop in others what has been called a lay spirituality, they will have to keep alive in themselves a higher spirituality from which these lay people can catch fire, and to which they can return for inspiration and renewal and for periods of rest when the fray outside gets to be too much for them. If our Sisters of yesterday, therefore, needed careful spiritual training, our Sisters of today need it more. If it ever was enough for a Sister

to carry through a whole lifetime in religion on a basis of eighteen months of spiritual training, it does seem that this is no longer the case. The externals can be acquired in this time, but spiritual judgment, balance, maturity, cannot be acquired so readily—and these are the very qualities we need and are already calling for in the Sisters who serve in our parishes.

The human spirit has its own laws, and the need for time to work lasting changes is one of them. If the Sister of tomorrow is to have more contact with the world in her apostolate, then we must remove her farther and longer from the world while we are getting her ready. If she is to live in surroundings of turmoil, noise, and confusion, then we must help her a little longer to cultivate interior silence and calm. If she is going to have to work under intense pressure during a lifetime in order to meet the demand that she be a saint, scholar, and gentlewoman—for this is what tomorrow's world will ask of her—then we need to give her a start on saintliness, scholarship, and gentility before she goes into service. Above all, we need to give her a chance to grow in the love of God which will impel and sustain her through the white martyrdom of this kind of intense life.

In view of this, we might ask in all seriousness: Is this kind of formation a "luxury" in a period of Sister shortage? Quite the contrary, it may be that it is precisely because of the Sister shortage that we need to stop short and ask ourselves some pointed questions. Is it possible that our failure to provide the Sisters with a formation which would enable them to inspire girls by their spirituality and win their respect by their professional competence may not be one of the natural obstacles we are placing to the supernatural workings of God's grace in the vocations which must certainly be offered to the young in this period of the Church's need? It would appear that it is not a question of whether we can afford Sister formation, but of whether we can by any stretch of the imagination afford not to have it.

For the sake of argument, however, let us look at the actual statistics on what Sister formation may be doing to worsen the Sister shortage. According to the last figure we have—that of 1956—the percentage of all our Sisters in full-time training programs of any kind and for any purpose was 4.5%. When we take out the postulants and novices, a safe estimate would be that the

juniors—and these represent the true cost of the Sister formation proposal—are about 1.8% of the whole.

This does not mean, however, that 1.8% of our number are withdrawn from the teaching apostolate. It just means that their entrance is delayed for two years, and after this two years is over, the same number comes off the community assembly line every year as before. And their religious and professional life for possibly half a century is bettered by the fact of their initial preparation. A number of the very large communities, like the Sisters of Mercy of the Union, have already been through this two-year moratorium, so the Sister formation program is paid for, and should no longer be reckoned to cost anything in terms of the Sister shortage.

But let us look at this postponement of 1.8% of the entire group for two years in another light. As we noted above, the average rate of growth in our communities is 1.7% a year. Now this is an average, and for some reason (about which we know far too little), there is a wide fluctuation in this annual increment. Thus in 1946, after deaths, retirements, and those who leave the Communities had taken their toll and been subtracted from the increase through new vocations, the net gain was just 3/100ths of one per cent, or in actual numbers, 28 Sisters ahead, nationally.

In 1948 we moved ahead 2.9% with 2,275 extra Sisters reported. In 1949 the increase was only 526, nationally, but in 1955 we had a banner year, with 3,467 new teaching Sisters reported to Mr. Kenedy. Now undoubtedly this curve should be smoothed out a little, and variations in entrance dates and reporting periods probably account for some of the erratic statistics. Nevertheless, in the course of visits during the last two years to about two hundred Motherhouses, such odd figures continued to be quoted —vocations shooting up in one year from 7 to 25, or falling from 80 to 50. Hence there is no great difficulty involved in believing that one year's net increase in teaching Sisters may be twice last year's or half of last year's.

Therefore, if we reckon the cost in numbers of teaching Sisters, the difference between two good years and two bad years, vocation-wise, could wipe out the whole cost of a Sister formation program (and the cost of installing a Sister formation program, as we have seen, only needs to be paid once in the history of a community).

Wherever communities have had the full Sister formation program long enough for its effect to be felt in their schools, they report to us an increase of vocations—in some cases as much as a doubling. They report a great falling-off of those professed Sisters who leave the community. There is the case, for example, of one community with a total membership of less than two hundred, in which seven professed Sisters left in one year, attributable, in the judgment of the spiritual director, to overwork and insufficient formation. This can be contrasted with the record of another community, much larger, which has not lost a single Sister who completed the formation program since the year it was inaugurated, in 1940. Moreover, reports from all over the country indicate that parental opposition to vocations is decreasing as the parents come to realize that their daughters will be trained for their work.

We ought to view the Sister formation program, therefore, primarily not as making a Sister shortage, but as an indispensable element in alleviating it. For the problem of Sister shortage is essentially a problem of vocations. And in this connection, another point might be considered. We are getting our vocations mainly from the high schools—most of them from the all-girl schools, fewer from the co-institutional, and still fewer from the coeducational. We are beginning to get them in larger numbers from our colleges. Nevertheless, the high schools are still a key.

On the other hand, only 22% of the total Catholic population of secondary school age attend schools conducted by Sisters. To the teaching of this group, however, and to our whole apostolate in the colleges as well, we devoted just 24% of our Sisters, and many in this group are senior Sisters or Sisters who cannot manage the discipline in the elementary schools. Many of our young Sisters who would be most effective vocation recruiters cannot teach in high school at all because they do not have their degrees. And so we are trying to staff the entire Catholic school system with vocations drawn from a pool of perhaps a fourth of the possible subjects.

To put it in another way, we are trying to staff a school system of 4,786,013 students, elementary and high, with vocations drawn from 826,500 high school pupils. If, then, we hope ever to be able to staff our elementary schools, it seems that we need to increase this high school pool, and we may wonder whether the pouring of

75% of our teaching Sisters into small elementary schools may not in the end defeat the best interests of those schools themselves. From one small girls' college and one small girls' high school located in the same city block in a Midwestern city—schools with a combined enrollment of about 900—there came, last year, 24 vocations. Things like this do not just happen. They have causes. Upon our identifying these causes and reproducing them, the future of Catholic education may depend.

The Sisterhoods of the United States need at least to double their numbers. It seems certain that, granting the grace of God which would surely not be withheld, the proper efforts on our part to eliminate present obstacles to correspondence with vocations would bring this increase about. It calls, however, for a national and for a planned effort. In this entire effort, of course, the Catholics of the whole country would have a part to play. The Sisterhoods would have a part through the great movement launched by the Holy Father and the Sacred Congregation for Religious and called "Renovation and Adaptation in the States of Perfection." The Sister formation program is a part of this movement.

The priests of America will naturally be an indispensable part of this effort. We are finding in our research and discussion about vocations that the unit which seems to determine what is thought about Sisters and what parents will encourage their daughters to do is not so much the city or diocese or the individual religious congregation. It is either the private school or the parish. In each parish there is what the sociologists and psychologists are beginning to call "an image" of the Sister. We tend to find that if in any one year you get a good number of fine girls for the novitiate, the next year this is likely to be repeated—and with the same kind of girl.

Another parish or another school may experience a comparable phenomenon—but in another direction. The image of the Sister that exists in the parish, then, is an important factor in determining which girls will think of themselves as being cut to this pattern. The Sisters themselves, of course, are primarily responsible for the image of themselves which is created—and no amount of effort by pastors, vocation directors, Serra Clubs, or inspirational literature can undo the scandal of unkind deeds, or worldly attitudes, or incompetent teaching.

The Sisters, however, are dependent upon priests for no small part of the picture of the teaching Sister that is current in the parish. If this life is represented as a noble one, worthy of respect, and help, and proper training, as a life for the strong and the dedicated, a life for mature balanced personalities who will fill roles of spiritual and intellectual leadership in tomorrow's world—if, finally, not only the Sister's vocation is honored, but the call, also, to be the *parent* of a Sister, there will be vocations in the parish.

The priests of America have done this, of course, through the years. In the teaching Sisterhoods particularly, we have been close to our pastors, and the pastors have been fathers, brothers, leaders, and friends to us. Our golden jubilarian Sisters look back upon fruitful lives and divide their years into parishes. They do not tell others that it was two years before the war or three years after the depression. They say: "It was in Father So-and-So's time!"

The Sister shortage has created an hour of need for all of us —for the Sisters, for the priests, for the Catholic family—for all of Catholic education. In this as in so many crises in the past, we may look to the assistance and leadership of the American priests, realizing full well their interest in the problem, their desire to be well-informed, and their traditional spirit of taking those steps needed to remedy a difficult situation.

SISTER MARY EMIL, I.H.M.

Sister Formation Conferences
National Catholic Educational Association
Washington, D. C.

THE SACRAMENTAL CHARACTER AS THE KEY TO UNDERSTANDING CHRISTIAN LIFE

Thanks to the efforts of those interested and informed concerning the liturgy, it has become clear to all that this apostolate is basically a theological movement. This is, in many ways, its most significant contribution of recent years. For the obstacles which previously interfered with the progress of this endeavor—obstacles based on the false notion that the liturgy was a matter of externals—have been removed by the emphatic manner in which the true nature of the liturgy as worship has been depicted. No serious inquirer today questions that what the late Pope called "a sign of the providential dispositions of God for the present time, of the movement of the Holy Ghost in the Church" has its foundation in Sacred Scripture, the Tradition of the Church, and the writings of theologians.

Because of this, we are witnessing more and more efforts to bring about a greater realization of those theological truths which bear most directly on an understanding of the Christian vocation. One of these is the nature and function of the sacramental character. Yet it is undeniable that thus far this has not been the subject of any detailed presentation, at least on the popular level. Indeed, it is often neglected or merely mentioned even by those whose enthusiasm for a greater understanding of Christian living is beyond question.

This omission is not difficult to understand. Until the present time, the sacraments have been considered primarily in terms of the grace which they produce, and even in the case of those three which imprint a character, it has been the production of grace which has been given the greater emphasis. This all too common presentation of the sacraments exclusively as causes of grace is reflected in the descriptions of Baptism, Confirmation, and Holy Orders which one hears not only from grammar school pupils but even from seminarians and our teaching Sisters. Baptism, we are told, is the sacrament which takes away original sin; Confirmation makes us soldiers of Christ by giving us strength; Holy Orders gives us the grace to live as a priest. If we question our students further, they

will admit that these three sacraments also give a character and this many of them can identify in no more detail than as some sort of "spiritual mark."

In addition to this unbalanced view, there is the difficulty arising from our incomplete knowledge of the sacramental character itself. There is nothing astounding in this to one who is even generally aware of the lack of precision with which both Scripture and Tradition refer to the character. But in spite of this there is a body of teaching which has resulted from centuries of theological effort from which much can be drawn to help us realize the importance of the character in our life as members of the redeemed community.

PARTICIPATION IN THE PRIESTHOOD OF CHRIST

The importance of the character is based in its very nature as a participation in the priesthood of Christ. Those sealed with Holy Baptism "participate according to their condition in the priesthood of Christ Himself" (*Mediator Dei,* 110). The priesthood of Christ is, therefore, the point at which any discussion of the sacramental character must start. This is substantiated by the study of the character by Father Galot, S.J. (*La Nature du Caractere Sacramentel,* p. 190). He points out that the advance made by St. Thomas on the subject between the writing of the *Sentences* and the writing of the *Summa* had its origin in the intervening consideration he gave to the priesthood of Christ. Of interest also is the statement of the same author that the Thomistic teaching that the character is a power of worship resulted from a reversal of the previous theological practice of considering Baptism as the sacrament in which the character was verified most perfectly. For St. Thomas it was not Baptism but Orders which served as the exemplar of the doctrine of the character.

The priesthood of Christ which is the basis of the sacramental character was the means of uniting God and man and it is therefore in terms of this union between the Creator and his creature that the character stands out in clearest light. As Christ's role in human history was one of restoring the union originally effected at creation, so the character must be seen in relation to this priestly work of Christ. It is the character which makes it possible for individual men to be united directly to His saving work. This work began with the union of God and man in the Incarnation which was Christ's consecration as a priest.

St. Thomas describes the work of a priest as follows: "The office proper to a priest is to be a mediator between God and the people: to wit, inasmuch as He bestows Divine things on the people . . . and again, forasmuch as He offers up the people's prayers to God" (IIIa, p. 22, a.1). From the moment of His Incarnation Christ performed the priestly work of bringing divine things to men and bringing man's prayers to God. Throughout His whole life He carried on this work of worship, the work of uniting God and man. It reached its climax, as in the case of every priest, in His sacrifice. "During his stay on earth . . . he worked for the salvation of souls by continuously praying and consecrating himself, until finally, hanging on the cross, He offered Himself an unspotted victim to God, to cleanse our conscience from dead works that we might serve the living God. . . . As soon as the Word was made flesh He showed himself to the world clothed in His priestly office, subjecting Himself to His Eternal Father, and indeed, He never ceased to do this throughout the full course of His life. . . . This priestly office He fulfilled in a wondrous way in the bloody sacrifice of the cross" (*Mediator Dei,* 1, 22).

As Christ was the only one who could unite God and man, so his priesthood is the only means by which this mutual exchange, this *admirabile commercium,* of God's gifts and man's prayers could be effected. It is the sacramental character which grants us a sharing in this priesthood. Union with God results from our possession of grace, of course, and God may bestow this divine gift on one not sealed with the character. Yet without this seal we do not have the participation in the priestly work of Christ which makes possible the proper development of our life of grace through the reception of the sacraments and the fulfillment of man's fundamental obligation of rendering true worship to God at the Eucharistic sacrifice. St. Thomas insists that the character enables us to worship God "according to the rite of the Christian religion" (IIIa, q.63, a.2). He distinguishes clearly between the role of grace and the role of the character; he emphasizes that it is the latter which assimilates us to Christ's priesthood, the sole means of rendering true worship to God. "Now the faithful are deputed to a twofold end. First and principally to the enjoyment of glory. And for this purpose they are marked with the seal of grace. . . . Secondly, each of the faithful is deputed to receive, or to bestow on others, things pertaining to the worship of God. And this, properly speaking, is

the purpose of the sacramental character. Now the whole rite of the Christian religion is derived from Christ's priesthood. Consequently it is clear that the sacramental character is specially the character of Christ, to whose character the faithful are likened by reason of the sacramental characters, which are nothing else than certain participations of Christ's priesthood, flowing from Christ Himself" (IIIa, q.63, a.3). Since the "rite of the Christian religion" belongs to the Catholic Church, as we shall describe in the next section, those who are not empowered to share in this rite are in that precarious state described in *Mystici Corporis:* "We ask each and every one of them to correspond to the interior movements of grace, and to seek to withdraw from that state in which they cannot be sure of their salvation. For even though by an unconscious desire and longing they have a certain relationship with the Mystical Body of the Redeemer, they still remain deprived of those many heavenly gifts and helps which can only be enjoyed in the Catholic Church" (103).

If more attention were given to the priesthood of Christ as exercised throughout His life and to the character which grants us a share in this priesthood, we might find that our meditation on the various events of His life would lead us to a deeper penetration of our vocation as members of the redeemed people of God. Since in all He did there was present the priestly purpose of giving homage to God and salvation to men, we would be reminded by each episode that the possession of the character should lead us to be motivated in all we do by this same holy purpose, that of uniting ourselves and all men to God.

THE CHARACTER AND THE CHURCH

A true appreciation of the sacramental character cannot be limited to its relationship with the priestly work which Christ performed in His mortal body. His priesthood did not cease with His death but continues its saving work in His Mystical Body. "The Divine Redeemer wished, then, that the priestly life which He began in His earthly body by His prayers and by His sacrifice should not cease throughout the centuries in His Mystical Body which is the Church" (*Mediator Dei,* 2). Only when we see the Church as continuing Christ's priestly work can we understand the full significance and dignity of membership in the Church and of the sacramental character which makes us a member or admits us

to a closer share in this priestly work. The character gives us a share in Christ's priesthood and this priesthood continues to operate through the Church. Thus in being given a participation in this priesthood we are, by that very fact, given membership or fuller powers in the Church. Speaking of the effect of the character of Baptism, Fr. Francis Connell says, "The principal function of the character is to depute the recipient to divine worship, and because under the law of the gospel, from divine ordination, true worship of God is found only in the Church established by Christ, every baptized person by divine right is incorporated into the true or Catholic Church" (*De Sacramentis Ecclesiae,* p. 140). It is principally through the sacrifice, sacraments, and prayer of the Church that the priestly work of Christ continues. "In every liturgical action its divine founder is present with the Church: Christ is present in the august sacrifice of the altar, both in the person of His minister and especially under the Eucharistic Species; He is present in the sacraments by His power which pours into them that they may be efficacious instruments of sanctity; He is present in the praises and in the petitions directed to God, as it is written, 'For where two or three are gathered together for My sake, there am I in the midst of them' " (*Mediator Dei,* 28). Since the priestly work which Christ continues through His Mystical Body is carried out through her sacrifice, sacraments, and prayers, it is a participation in these which the character gives. The use of this power by its recipients is the worship of God "according to the rite of the Christian religion."

All of this points out that a deep concept of Christian life must include a marked appreciation of the Church in God's plan for our sanctification. Since the Church is the continuation of the Incarnation and to her have been intrusted the sacrifice of Christ to offer together with her Head and the sacraments and prayer of Christ, there can be no accurate apprehension of what it is to be a Christian without a grasp of the nature of the Church. This is a point which has been made with great force many times in recent years but it has relevance here because a knowledge of the sacramental character has a major role to play in bringing men to such a realization and love of the Mystical Body of Christ. The vocation which is ours is called "Christian" both because the Anointed has made it possible and because we share this life as members of His Church. We live Christ's life because we are the Church through which He continues

to offer praise to God and to communicate God's gifts to men. We are indeed a "royal priesthood" because we have a share in that priestly work of union which will continue until our High Priest comes again in glory. It is the sacramental character which makes all this possible.

DEPUTATION TO WORSHIP

Because the sacramental character grants us a participation in the priesthood of Christ which is a work of worship, we are deputed to worship God by our reception of that seal. This is but the logical consequence of what has already been said. How that deputation is effected by the individual characters is beyond the scope of this article which endeavors to present the implications of the sacramental character in general. What bears stressing here is that without this deputation one cannot worship God "according to the rite of the Christian religion," which is the only fitting way in which man may now pay homage to his Creator. There is no priest but Christ and no true worship of God outside of His priesthood. He alone could have wrought redemption. His bloody sacrifice is the supreme act of His priesthood and the Eucharistic renewal of this sacrifice is the only perfect act of worship available to man. The sacraments which Christ instituted are the means by which He communicates His life to us and by which He teaches us the truths by which men live. These, together with His prayer, He has handed over to His Church that she might continue His priestly work. To her must all men go, that they may be deputed by the sacramental character to take part in these holy actions. She has the seal which marks men with the sign of the Lamb. She is the inn wherein the Good Samaritan has left the provision for whatever wounded human nature needs to be restored to salvation. She alone can make us Christ's members, spiritual adults, and priests of the Most High God by means of the sacramental character without which men can have no share in the priestly work of her Spouse.

THE CHARACTER A POWER

It is unfortunate, and somewhat amazing that the sacramental character has been described almost exclusively in terms which do not reflect its basic function. Although the character, as St. Thomas admits, is in a sense a sign, it is in his opinion basically a power (IIIa, q.63, a.1,2). By the character we are granted the

power to worship. Prior to St. Thomas, when the character was discussed almost exclusively in terms of Baptism, its nature as a sign or figure was predominant, as Father Galot points out. But when the Angelic Doctor viewed it as most perfectly substantiated in Orders, he set forth the teaching which has been commonly accepted: that the character is fundamentally a power. The discussion of the character and its connection with Christ's priesthood and His Church shows how important this advance in the classification of its nature is. Yet, in all but a few modern books of instruction, the pre-Thomistic view has greater emphasis. The average student will describe the character as "a spiritual mark" with no conception of its role as an ability to join in acts of worship. It seems obvious that if we are to gain for ourselves and communicate to those we teach the glorious role of the character in Christian life we must adhere more closely to the teaching of the *Summa.* Such a presentation will be much more fruitful and indeed more accurate. This is not to say that the other aspect is to be ignored (after all, St. Thomas himself says the character is a "res et *sacramentum*"); there is great value in our realization that by the character we are marked as members of Christ's flock or as those sheep to whom further identity with Christ has been given. But the exclusive attention which is sometimes given to the character as a sign does prevent a proper penetration of its significance. What must be done is to show that this mark makes us capable of certain priestly acts, that those marked as Christians have a share in the power which Christ exercises through those so signed who make up His Mystical Body. To the sheep of his pasture the Good Shepherd grants a brand which is at the same time a power to join in the worship of God. By the character we do not simply become marked as Christ's but, in a manner in which we cannot fully understand, by the power to join in the priestly work which He carries on through His Mystical Body, we become the extension of Christ.

THE CHARACTER AND THE SACRAMENTAL RITE

The mark and power which are given by the character are the result of the sacramental rite. It would be most helpful in our attempts to understand the place of the character in Christian life if more attention were given to this connection between the rite and the character. Indeed, so closely was this relationship realized

in patristic times that the rite and the character were often identified. We do not wish, of course, to set aside the significant contribution which has been made by the scholastic distinction between the two, but it is possible to emphasize their connection without forfeiting this. All are aware that the sacraments are signs of the grace which they signify, but it is also the teaching of theologians that the rite is a sign of the character and the cause of its impression. Much can be done to bring out the value of the sacraments as signs. Should we not complete this effort by stressing that the rite is also, in three cases, the sign and cause of the character? Is there not something incomplete in the picture of Baptism solely as the efficacious sign of the grace of regeneration? Indeed, the baptismal rite is also a sign of our participation in the priesthood of Christ, membership in the Church, and deputation to worship which are effected by the character. Because we receive the sign of Christ's death and resurrection, we are made sharers in the priestly work which reached its culmination in this sacrifice of redemption; because of this sign we are initiated into the Mystical Body into which we "would not have been united . . . through the waters of Baptism except by the salutary virtue of the Cross" (*Mystici Corporis,* 30); because of this sacramental death and resurrection we are empowered to worship God according to the rite of the Christian religion. Confirmation is not only an efficacious sign of strengthening grace but also of the state of spiritual manhood; it is not only the means of participating in the grace of maturity but commissions us to a new status in the Church; it is not only a figure of more abundant helps in fulfilling our vocation but tells us of the more intimate share it effects in the priestly work of Christ. The need of emphasis in this matter with regard to Orders is less acute because it has been favored by a more accurate presentation of the connection between its rite and its character.

THE CHARACTER AND GLORY

One of the aspects of the character which has been insisted upon throughout all theological discussion is its indelibility. In spite of this emphasis in patristic and scholastic writings and its strong implication in St. Paul's doctrine of the "sealing" of the Christian for the day of redemption (*Eph.* 4:30), we find infrequent appeal to the character to show that the sacraments are signs of glory. Yet this is underlined in the works of the Fathers and theologians

and is clearly the teaching of St. Thomas. The Angelic Doctor says that while it is the seal of grace which deputes men to the enjoyment of glory (IIIa, q.63, a.3), the character will remain forever to the glory of the saved and the shame of the condemned. "Although external worship does not last after this life, yet its end remains. Consequently, after this life the character remains, both in the good as adding to their glory, and in the wicked as increasing their shame: just as the character of the military service remains in the soldiers after the victory as the boast of the conquerors and the disgrace of the conquered" (IIIa, q.63, a.5, ad.3).

The indirect but real connection between the character and glory is immediately evident if we remember the repeated teaching of St. Thomas that it is a participation in the priesthood of Christ and a share in "a certain spiritual power with regard to the sacraments and to things pertaining to the Divine worship" (IIIa, q.63, a.5). Since it is through the sacraments and divine worship that man is to attain his eternal reward, the character which grants him the power to use these holy things is most certainly connected with the end to which they lead. Insistence on this connection will do much to help us appreciate the eschatological aspect of Christian life, an aspect which all would agree needs to be emphasized since the whole purpose of our life of union in Christ on earth is to lead us to the unending union with God in glory.

The sacramental character is the key to Christian living because to be a Christian is to live "in Christ." Through the exercise of His priesthood on earth Christ enabled mankind to be raised to this supernatural mode of existence; through the continuation of this priestly activity in His Mystical Body He vitalizes individual men. His Spouse begets and cares for those who are her obedient and loving children. Through her Christ deputes them to have a share in His perfect worship of the Father by the communication of a marvelous power. The significance of this deputation is proclaimed by the holy rites by which it is communicated. The faithful use of this power leads to the possession of the glory which is the goal of Christian living. The instrument which the High Priest uses to restore all things in Himself is the sacramental character.

J. RICHARD QUINN

Saint John's Seminary
Brighton, Massachusetts

TOWER OF DAVID

Few prayers authorized and indulgenced by the Catholic Church are as beloved or as widely used as the Litany of Loreto. Thousands of times every day devout members of the Church address this magnificent series of petitions to Our Lady. In all of these petitions we ask the same favor. We beg the Virgin Mother of God to pray for us. Yet in each of these petitions we employ a different title, a different designation, of Our Lady. And an examination of the titles we apply to her in this beautiful formula will definitely serve to bring out the dignities and the functions God has reserved to her in the economy of the supernatural order.

The first three of the petitions addressed to Mary in the Litany of Loreto stress her exalted and unique holiness. We begin this series of petitions by appealing to her as "Holy Mary," as "Holy Mother of God," and as "Holy Virgin of Virgins." Then eleven times more the Litany uses titles in which Our Lady is designated as "Mother." Six more petitions are addressed to her as "Virgin." The last twelve petitions in the Litany employ Our Lady's queenly titles.

Between the "Virgin" titles and the "Queen" titles the text of the Litany carries seventeen other petitions, in which Our Lady is appealed to under what are sometimes known as her "mystical" designations. Three of these titles employ the term "Vessel," as this word is found in the Epistles of St. Paul. Two more use the word "Tower" as a title of the Blessed Mother, obviously referring to the way this term is used in the Canticle of Canticles. Our Lady is designated as the "Tower of David" and as the "Tower of Ivory."

The first of these expressions is obviously an application to Mary of the terminology in the fourth chapter of the Canticles:

> Thy neck is as the tower of David, which is built with bulwarks: a thousand bucklers hang upon it, all the armor of valiant men.[1]

The second is taken from the seventh chapter of this same inspired book. "Thy neck is as a tower of ivory."[2]

In both of these passages the Divine Lover is proclaiming the matchless beauty of His beloved. The "Tower of Ivory" designation is a figure of speech meant to bring out the beloved's spotless

[1] *Cant.*, 4:4. [2] *Cant.*, 7:4.

purity. On the other hand, the title "Tower of David" is clearly intended to show strength and fidelity. And, in the actual use of this expression in the scholastic literature of the Catholic Church, the "Tower of David" became the center, the armory and the refuge, from which the battle for the defense of the teaching of Our Lord was conducted.

Interestingly enough, this title is incorporated into the very prologue of the work which was to be the standard textbook of Catholic scholastic theology during its glorious early period. From the twelfth century until the latter years of the sixteenth century, the course of scholastic theology in the Church's universities centered around an explanation of and a commentary on the *Four Books of Sentences* of Peter the Lombard. And the prologue to the first of these four books opens with the following passage:

> Desiring, with the poor little woman, to cast something out of our poverty and weakness into the Lord's treasury, we have presumed to ascend to arduous things and to take up a work beyond our strength. Our confidence that this work will be completed and that it will be rewarded is founded upon that Samaritan who, after paying the two coins for the care of the man who had been left half dead, promised on His return to give all the rest that would be required. The truth of the One who has made the promise delights us, but the immensity of the task terrifies us. The desire of doing a service urges us on. But the weakness of failure discourages us. The zeal of the house of God overcomes this weakness.
>
> Burning with that zeal, we have been at pains to defend our faith against the errors of carnal and animal men with *the shields of the tower of David,* or rather to show that it is so defended, and to manifest the recondite points of theological inquiry and also, according to the modest capacity of our own understanding, to bring out some information about the ecclesiastical sacraments. We were unable rightly to resist the entreaties of the brethren devoted to study who begged us to aid them in their investigation by our oral and written teaching. The twofold charity of Christ motivates that teaching in us.[3]

In this second paragraph of the prologue, the Master of the Sentences informs his readers that he is going to accomplish three objectives in the course of this volume. He announces that he will defend our faith with the shields of the tower of David, that he will explain certain recondite points of theology, and that he will

[3] *Libri IV Sententiarum* (Quarrachi, 1916), I, 1.

teach about the sacraments. The two paragraphs which follow immediately after the two we have already translated make it perfectly clear that, in the mind of Peter the Lombard, the defensive function of sacred theology was to pervade the entire course of his teaching. There is no section on the defense of the faith which is in any way distinct from the teaching of theology, or from the treatise on the sacraments. Peter continues:

Although we are in no doubt whatsoever about the fact that every word of human eloquence has always been subject to the calumny and contradiction of rivals, because, when wills are opposed, the views of intelligences are likewise divergent, in such a way that, even when every statement is perfect in the way of truth, still, while something else either appears or appeals to others, the error of impiety opposes the truth which is not understood or which is displeasing, and there results the envy of the will which the god of this world brings about in those children of unbelief who do not subject the will to reason and who do not devote themselves to the study of doctrine, but who strive to adapt the words of wisdom to the things they dream up, seeking not the truth, but what pleases them. An evil will incites these people, not to an understanding of the truth, but to the defence of the things that please them. They do not want to be taught the truth, but they rather turn away from it and listen to fables. It is their profession to look for things that please them rather than things that should be taught, not to want what ought to be taught, but to adapt the teaching to the things they want. They have a show of wisdom in superstition, since a mendacious hypocrisy follows upon a faintness of the faith, so that the piety which the conscience has lost may rather be in the words. By every mendacious use of words they render impious the simulated piety itself. Striving to corrupt the holiness of the faith by the teaching of false doctrine, conveying to others an itching of the ears under cover of the novel teaching they tailor according to their desires, these men who work for disunity wage relentless war against the truth. For there is a continual battle being waged between the assertion of what is true and the defence of what is pleasing, when the truth protects itself and the will for error protects itself.

Desiring to overthrow the *ecclesia* of these men, which is hateful to God, and to shut their mouths, lest they be able to pour the poison of wickedness into others, and also wishing to set the light of truth upon the candlestick, in much labor and sweat we have, with God's help, composed this volume out of the eternally established testimonies of truth. The volume is divided into four books.[4]

[4] *Ibid.*, 2 f.

I have quoted the translation of this section of the prologue to the *Sentences* at some length since it would appear that all the implications underlying Peter the Lombard's use of the expression "Tower of David" must be considered and understood if we are to appreciate the meaning of that title in the Litany of Loreto. We should not allow ourselves to forget that the title was applied to Our Lady in the Litany by theologians who were familiar with the use of the expression in the Canticle of Canticles, and who were very well aware of the way this expression had been employed in the prologue to the *Four Books of Sentences*. And, as a matter of fact, the great contribution to Mariology expressed in this title of Our Lady in the Litany of Loreto is to be found precisely in the fact that the function attributed to the Tower of David in the *Sentences* is predicated of Our Lady in the Litany. By its approval of the Litany, the Church itself has given support and authorization to this teaching.

Now in the section of the prologue which we have just translated, it is quite obvious that Peter the Lombard considers the theological defense of the Catholic faith as part of an unrelenting war between two social units. To assert the truths of the faith, the truths which the Catholic Church proposes to us as having been revealed by God through Jesus Christ Our Lord, is to react against the denial and the misrepresentations of these truths, a denial that emanates ultimately from His undying enemy. Peter the Lombard, like all the other great masters of Catholic truth, saw the Catholic Church and its teaching in the context later set forth in the opening passage of Pope Leo XIII's encyclical *Humanum genus*. Pope Leo wrote:

> The race of man, after its miserable fall from God, the Creator and the Giver of heavenly gifts, "through the envy of the devil," separated into two diverse parts, of which the one steadfastly contends for truth and virtue, the other for those things which are contrary to virtue and to truth. The one is the kingdom of God on earth, the true Church of Jesus Christ; and those who desire from their heart to be united with it so as to gain salvation must of necessity serve God and His only-begotten Son with their whole mind and with an entire will. The other is the kingdom of Satan, in whose possession and control are all whosoever follow the fatal example of their leader and of our first parents, those who refuse to obey the divine and eternal law, and who have many aims of their own in contempt of God, and many aims also against God.

This twofold kingdom St. Augustine keenly discerned and described after the manner of two cities, contrary in their laws because striving for contrary objects; and with subtle brevity he expressed the efficient cause of each in these words: "Two loves formed two cities: the love of self, reaching even to contempt of God, an earthly city; and the love of God, reaching even to contempt of self, a heavenly one." At every period of time each has been in conflict with the other, with a variety and multiplicity of weapons and of warfare, although not always with equal ardor and assault.[5]

The men who learned their theology through a study of Peter the Lombard and the writers who commented on the *Four Books of Sentences* conceived the function of the "Tower of David" in the light of this background.

(1) They realized that the entire human race is, and has been since the days of our first parents, divided into two distinct and mutually hostile groups. One of these is the kingdom or the *ecclesia* of God in Christ. The other is the kingdom or *ecclesia* of Satan. It was to this latter that Peter the Lombard referred when he said that it was his wish to overthrow the church hateful to God *(Deo odibilem ecclesiam evertere)*. Every human being is in one or the other of these two groups. Yet it remains possible to be within the one and to work for the objectives of the other. The kingdom or the *ecclesia* of God is the true Church of Christ, and this alone. It is, in the dispensation of the New Testament, definitely not the combination of the Church and all men of good will. It is the Catholic Church.

(2) These two groups are engaged, and, until the end of time will be engaged, in relentless and unceasing conflict against each other. There is no such thing as neutrality on this point. Those who are not with Our Lord are against Him.

(3) The warfare of the kingdom of Satan against the true and supernatural kingdom of God is preeminently and inevitably centered in an attempt to destroy the Catholic faith, in function of which the true Church is the *congregatio fidelium in Christo*.[6] Thus the basic effort against Our Lord and His Church is to be found in a striving to contradict or to modify the divine teachings

[5] In Father Wynne's edition of *The Great Encyclical Letters of Leo XIII* (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1903), p. 83.

[6] Cf. Fenton, "Scholastic Definitions of the Catholic Church," Part I, in *AER*, CXI, 1 (July, 1944), 59 f.

which are to be accepted within the Church with the assent of divine and Catholic faith. Thus the shields or the bucklers of the Tower of David, which are the ornament and the defense of the beloved of the Canticles, the true Church of Jesus Christ, are pre-eminently fashioned for the defense of the Church's divine teaching. The man who enters the list to defend the Church against its enemies, to defend it against the attempts made by the kingdom of Satan, sets out to defend our faith with the shields of the tower of David, or rather, as Peter the Lombard said, to show that it is so defended.

(4) It would be worse than idle to assume that the world stands as a neutral or benevolent arbiter, ready to weigh objectively the merits of Our Lord's teaching within His Church. Actually the doctrine of Christ is under unremitting attack. To assert His message is to defend it. Our Lord called Satan "the prince of this world."[7] The world, as the kingdom of Satan, is and will be opposed to His teachings, and favorable to any contradiction or modification of these teachings.

(5) Opposition to the truth of Jesus Christ is definitely not based on any unbiased scientific inquiry or motivated by rationally acceptable evidence. Basically it is an effort to counter or to change the teachings of the faith in favor of theses that are pleasing to those who oppose Our Lord and His kingdom. Incidentally, this has never been more obviously true than it is today, in the light of contemporary efforts against the purity and the integrity of the Catholic faith.

(6) Parenthetically, it must be recognized that the most effective work against the truth of Christ can be done, and actually has been done, by men who are members of the true Church itself, and especially by those who hold some particularly honorable place in it. These men, though members of the Church, actually work for the objectives of the prince of this world.

The history of the heresy of Modernism brings this point out with singular clarity. Men like Houtin, Hebert, Loisy, and Tyrrell exercised incalculably more influence against the purity and the integrity of the Catholic faith before they left the Church than they ever did as non-Catholics. It was a realization of this fact that made Von Hügel, the most vicious of the Modernists, strive to prevent those

[7] Cf. *John*, 12:31; 14:30; 16:11.

who shared his views from abandoning their membership in the Church.

(7) There exists in the Church some central rampart, some basis for defense, to which those who propose the true teaching of Christ and defend it in His Church can rally, and in which they can find their strength and support. This factor is designated under the figure of the tower of David. It is a strong tower, built with bulwarks. It is a tower within which the valiant men who defend the teaching of the Gospel can combat most effectively and triumphantly.

Peter the Lombard makes no effort to identify this "Tower of David." There is, however, another master work of theology, quite familiar to the men who composed and authorized the Litany of Loreto, in which such an identification is made. This is the famed *Summa de ecclesia* of the Cardinal John de Turrecremata.

In one place in this volume the eminent Dominican states that the "turris David" is the faith itself. He is speaking about the conformity and the union of the members with Our Lord in the Mystical Body.

> And by faith, which is the meaning of the "neck," in the text "Thy neck is as the tower of David," they [the members] are united to Him. In the fourth chapter of the Ephesians we read of the Head, Christ, from whom the whole body, that is the Church, being compacted and fitly joined together by what every joint supplieth. The *Glossa* interprets this to mean faith and charity which join the members of Christ to one another and make them work for one another.[8]

But in the subsequent chapter Turrecremata likens the neck of the Church, the beloved, which is like the tower of David, and which is like a tower of ivory, to the prelates of the Church.

> By the neck, by which the body is joined to the Head and by which food is brought to the body and incorporated into it we understand the prelates, who, by dispensing the nourishment of doctrine and the sacraments of the Church to others, incorporate those others into Christ and into the Church . . . Such men are said to be a tower because by the examples of a holy life and by the power of the word they are made for others like the ramparts of an unconquerable fortified tower.[9]

---

[8] *Summa de ecclesia,* Lib. I, c. 43.
[9] *Ibid.,* c. 44.

Thus, for the greatest of the ecclesiologists, the members of the apostolic college are in some way designated as the tower of David within the Church of God by reason of the fact that the preaching, and hence the defense, of the divinely revealed teaching is essentially their function. This is the lesson that has been brought out most clearly and effectively in our time with reference to the preaching of the word of God in Pope Benedict XV's encyclical *Humani generis,* and, for the teaching of sacred theology, in the allocution *Si diligis* of Pope Pius XII.

Likewise the faith itself, and especially faith animated by charity, may be considered as designated in the figurative expression "Tower of David." The preaching and the defense of the word of God is preeminently a work of faith which is enlivened by the love of the Triune God.

The men who composed and authorized the Litany of Loreto contributed to a magnificent advance in theological knowledge when they attributed this title to Our Lady. It had already been recognized that her influence had, in a definite and magnificently effective way, been responsible for the destruction of all the heresies which had troubled the Church of God.[10] It was a further advance explicitly to state that she deserves the mystical title of "Tower of David."

The true teaching of divinely revealed doctrine within the true Church, which must inevitably carry with it a defense of that doctrine, is seen as a work emanating from Our Lord Himself. The power and the brilliance by which the divine revelation have been defended over the course of the centuries are ultimately and really Our Lord's. The success of His cause, in the face of the never ending and relentless opposition of Satan, his kingdom, and his helpers, is due to Our Lord Himself. The Catholic hierarchy, who constitute His apostolic college, have been entrusted with that task. They act as His instruments and as His ambassadors. Those who have the privilege of being called by the members of that college to aid them in the performance of this doctrinal function are thus likewise called upon to propound and to defend that salutary teaching of Jesus Christ.

[10] Cf. Fenton, "Our Lady and the Extirpation of Heresy," in *AER* CXIV, 6 (June, 1946), 442-54.

When the Church designated Mary as the one by whom all the heresies throughout the entire world are destroyed, and when it honored her with the title "Tower of David," it was bearing witness to the fact that, in the final analysis, this doctrinal function of the Catholic Church is in a special and definite way her work and her responsibility. In thus describing her, the Church insists that she is eminently the cause of the destruction or the unmasking and the refutation of teachings contradictory to the doctrines contained in God's revealed message. It likewise asserts that she is as it were the central rampart or fortification, and that all the defensive doctrinal activity of the champions of the Catholic faith is gathered about her.

This doctrinal function of Our Lady as the "Tower of David" belongs to her in her capacity as the Mother of Christ and of His Mystical Body. Her activity in defending the faith is enlightened by the most perfect possession of the Beatific Vision among all the creatures of God. It is animated and motivated by the most ardent and powerful charity possessed by any creature. And it is immediately effected by her sovereignly efficacious prayer to God.

In naming Our Lady as the "Tower of David," and in pointing to her as the one through whom all the heresies of the world have been overcome, the Church thus wishes to indicate the fact that the preservation of the purity and the integrity of the Catholic faith against the attacks of its enemies is a task which, in the order of God's providence, depends on prayer. Mary's prayer is sovereignly efficacious, to the extent that the effect can be attributed to her alone. She advances and protects all the others who are privileged to take part in this most important function of her Son's Mystical Body. Thus she is truly the Tower of David.

When, in the Litany of Loreto, we pray to Mary as the Tower of David, we should call to mind the fact that we are meant to join with her in working and in begging God for the successful accomplishment of the work of defending the Catholic faith. The use of this beautiful title should influence all of us to appreciate still more the indescribable worth and beauty of the salvific message of the living God which Our Lord brings to us in the Catholic Church.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

Answers to Questions

LENTEN MASS AND OFFICE

Question: In the light of the Decree of March 23, 1955, as it concerns the recitation of the Divine Office during Lent, viz., permitting those in sacred orders to recite either the office of the saint of the day or the ferial office, is it permissible to offer the Mass of the saint of the day and recite the office of the Lenten feria?

Answer: Although it would be more in keeping with the spirit of the liturgy to conform the office to the Mass, the DGRS of 1955 does not prohibit, for those reciting the office privately, the arrangement you suggest. It should be emphasized, however, that Titulus II, 22 was obviously meant to make it possible for us to observe the spirit of Lent more fully without the breaks occasioned by the sanctoral cycle. Bugnini, in his commentary on the DGRS, suggests that a further reform may one day suppress the sanctoral cycle altogether during Lent, a practice already observed in the Ambrosian rite.

BLACK ZUCHETTO

Question: Recently some of the students here entered into a discussion about the wearing of the black skullcap by secular priests and clerics. In one reliable source which we found, dating from 1909, it was stated that such a practice was perfectly legitimate. However, we wondered whether this privilege still held good. Hence we thought you might be able to give us some information regarding the matter, or perhaps refer us to some book in which such a point is treated. We were also wondering whether such a cap is for clerics only, or if it could be worn also by seminarians not yet tonsured but who wear the cassock and collar.

Answer: There is so little change in matters of ecclesiastical costume that the 1909 source which you mention (surely it must be Nainfa, *The Costume of Prelates*) is still in most details a safe guide. There have indeed been some changes and Father McCloud had brought the Nainfa book up to date with his *Clerical Dress*

and Insignia (Bruce: Milwaukee 1948). With regard to the use of the skullcap by clerics, McCloud, after discussing its use by prelates, says merely: "All other clerics, if they wish to use the skullcap, must use a black skullcap" (p. 80). Nainfa gives the further information: "The use of the calotte having been introduced for no other purpose than to cover the tonsure, in order to protect the head from cold, it follows that those who are not clerics are not entitled to wear this cap. For this reason, the custom of allowing sanctuary boys to wear the calotte has been frequently condemned by the Sacred Congregation of Rites" (p. 116).

Granting the legitimacy of the black skullcap for clerics, we must still face the strong force of custom in this country. The prudent fear of singularity will, I believe, make it unnecessary for purveyors of church goods to lay in a large stock of black skullcaps.

MASS SERVER'S COMMUNION

Question: In preparing a chalice for a private Mass at an altar where the Blessed Sacrament is not reserved, is it freely allowable for a sacristan of his own accord to put on the paten a small host to be consecrated for the server's Communion? The servers I have in mind are professed religious or postulants who are accustomed to receive Communion daily or nearly every day, and who know that a host has been put on the paten for them. But in the situation considered here the server often has no opportunity to remove the host before the Mass starts, should he not wish to receive Communion on some particular day. The result could be inconvenience and embarrassment that would be avoided if the server himself would put a small host (from a container that could be kept on the credence) on the corporal or on the paten when the priest uncovers it at the Offertory of the Mass. Besides, it seems that no sacristan should presume to put a small host on the paten for the server. For this case seems to be similar to that covered by a statement of the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments (Dec. 8, 1938) which cautions Superiors against having the Holy Eucharist taken to a sick religious who has not expressly requested it. In both cases a person is put in a position to receive Communion when he has not expressly signified his intention of doing so.

Answer: The spirit of the reserved instruction issued by the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments on Dec. 8, 1938, certainly

seems opposed to the practice you mention. The alternatives you suggest should be followed.

ET INCARNATUS EST

Question: What should be the posture of clerics in choir at the singing of the *Et incarnatus est?* What about the congregation in the pews?

Answer: There is only one direction for all: those who are sitting at the time remain seated, uncover if they are wearing birettas, and all bow the head. If they are still standing when the chanters reach the words, all kneel.

VARIA

Question 1: If the residential Bishop, by indult or custom, assists at the throne at a Solemn Mass wearing the mozetta and not the cappa magna or cope, should he put incense in the thurible, read the Introit, Epistle, etc.?

Answer 1: Stehle, in his *Manual of Episcopal Ceremonies,* tells us that, if the Ordinary, by virtue of a special indult, occupies the throne wearing rochet and mozetta, he "does not read from the Missal, does not kiss the book, or bless any person or thing." He would, therefore, not put the incense in the thurible.

Question 2: At a Solemn Requiem Mass should the subdeacon put incense in the thurible before the Consecration or should this be done by the master of ceremonies or other server?

Answer 2: Rubricians are agreed that the incense is to be put in the thurible by the master of ceremonies, not by the subdeacon. Martinucci adds emphasis to the point: *"neque unquam id fiet a Subdiacono,"* and his reviser adds further emphasis with a footnote: *"Monemus quod Subdiaconus non debet thus immittere in thuribulum, quemadmodum extra regulam solent quidam"* (Vol. II, P. I, 101).

Question 3: Is there any reason for the practice at Solemn Mass by which the subdeacon carries the pall to the Gospel side after the ablutions? Is this use found in any rubric or in the approved authors?

Answer 3: There is no mention of this practice in the authors in popular use today (Martinucci, Fortescue, J. B. O'Connell, O'Connell-Schmitz). Apparently someone with an exaggerated sense of balance wanted the subdeacon to carry something while the deacon was carrying the Missal. The practice is meaningless and useless.

Question 4: Should torches be held by servers at Solemn Requiem Mass during the Canon and Communion?

Answer 4: All the authors mentioned in the previous answer tell us that the torchbearers should remain kneeling till after the Communion at a sung Requiem. This means that, if Communion is distributed, they are to remain until the ciborium is replaced in the tabernacle and the door is closed; if Communion is not distributed, they rise and leave the sanctuary after the celebrant has consumed the Precious Blood.

JOHN P. MCCORMICK, S.S.

THE OBLIGATION TO DENOUNCE VIOLATORS OF THE SACRAMENTAL SEAL

Question: Is there any obligation to inform ecclesiastical authorities that someone (priest or lay person) has violated the sacramental seal, or has been imprudent in conversation regarding matters connected with the confessional even though there is no real violation, either direct or indirect, of the seal?

Answer: There is no general law of the Church commanding that a person who discovers that a priest (or lay person who has overheard a confession) has violated the sacramental seal, or has spoken imprudently regarding matter learned from the tribunal of Penance must report the matter to ecclesiastical authorities. However, there is an instruction of the Holy Office, issued June 9, 1915 (cf. Bouscaren, *Canon Law Digest,* I, p. 414) telling Ordinaries and religious superiors to report to the Holy Office any serious case of a confessor who would speak imprudently of matters he has heard in the confessional and would not heed the warning given to him. (This instruction was never published in the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis,* and has not been incorporated into the Code.)

The divine law might at times impose an obligation to refer a case of this kind to the authorities—for example, if a priest were unlawfully using matter communicated to him in the confessional or making allusions to what he had heard there, thus giving grave scandal to those who would become aware of it. Charity would ordinarily require that first a private admonition be given to the violator with the hope that he may amend, so that only in the case that he still continues this practice would there be an obligation to report him.

MORAL PROBLEMS CONNECTED WITH TELEVISION

Question: Will you please comment on the moral aspects of practices recently discovered in the television industry, particularly the so-called "rigged" quiz programs?

Answer: Evidently the questioner is referring to the "intelligence tests" which have provided popular programs on television in recent years. Many of these have now been proved to have been "rigged"—that is, actually prepared and rehearsed beforehand, although everything about the show seemed to indicate that the contestants were enunciating facts which they had learned by their own efforts. I have no hesitation in saying that those who took part in such programs were guilty of a lie in action. It must be remembered that a person can tell a lie in deed as well as in words. Now, all the persons directly connected with these shows gave the impression in their manner of conduct that the questions were not known to the contestants beforehand and that their success in giving the correct answers was due to their own unaided memory or intellectual ability. Hence, when a contestant, after having been coached as to the questions he was to receive, went through the program with every indication that he was answering spontaneously and without any assistance, he was acting out a lie, a sin against the eighth commandment of God. And those who participated immediately in the deception—presuming they were aware of it—such as the interrogators, the sponsors, the producers, and the television officials, were guilty of the same sin.

Some have tried to defend this type of program on the score that it was intended to be entertainment, and that it achieved this purpose even though the programs were previously rehearsed. These quiz shows have been compared to televised plays in which

the actors pretend to be different persons than they really are. But the argument and the comparison are entirely irrelevant. Everyone knows that the actors in a show are not the persons they pretend to be. We are fully aware that the person representing Julius Caesar in the Shakespearean drama of that name is not really Caesar, and that the individual denounced as guilty of stealing horses in a western show is not actually a thief. But the quiz programs led the audience to believe that the performers were giving a genuine manifestation of extraordinary memory and intelligence. Indeed, the whole value of such programs rested on the presumption that the performers were unrehearsed and uncoached. How many persons would bother to tune in on them if it were announced that the contestants were told the answers beforehand?

Probably many persons now take an excessively cynical attitude toward all TV programs in the past which included any manner of intellectual testing. I do not think we should go to this extreme. It is reasonable to believe that some contestants were honest; and when we hear persons who were on such shows protest their innocence, we should take their word, as long as the contrary is not proved. Nor should we insist so vigorously on spontaneity in all programs as to denounce all rehearsing. For example, if a prominent person is being interviewed on television, some previous discussion with the interrogator is fully permissible. He can be told at least in a general way the questions he will be asked. The public should not regard such preparation as dishonest, especially since there is no contest and no money at stake. Such rehearsing gives the speaker a chance to organize his remarks so that they can be presented clearly and logically, and not be a jumble of disconnected and confusing statements.

What measure of gravity was present in the sin of prevarication committed by those who took part in the "rigging" of these television programs? A lie is *per se* a venial sin, but a lie may have circumstances connected with it that will render it mortally sinful. I do not regard myself as too strict when I say that there was objectively mortal sin committed by the direct participants in the "rigged" quiz programs—at least that were widely televised and were regularly seen by great numbers of persons. The main reason is that the discovery of the true situation (which should have been foreseen as at least probable by the perpetrators) brought down

great opprobrium on the United States in the eyes of the world (particularly on the part of hostile nations) and was also a source of grave scandal, particularly to young persons. How many children have suffered serious moral harm from the example of such widespread deception on the part of persons reputed to be individuals of intelligence and integrity! Add to this the lies that many told subsequently to exonerate themselves in the investigations, and the acts of injustice which were sometimes present, as will be described below. It would be wrong to say that all of these culprits were aware of the grave harm they were doing, and hence were guilty of serious sin subjectively. But taking the matter objectively, I believe that many mortal sins were committed in the production of these "rigged" quiz programs.

Besides those who directly co-operated in these dishonest shows, there were others who had only a silent and indirect part in the programs, such as the technicians and the stagehands. Even if these were aware of the deception (I believe they rarely were) I would hesitate to ascribe grave guilt to their conduct, since their co-operation was remote. Perhaps the serious inconvenience they would anticipate if they refused to take part (including sometimes the loss of their jobs) would excuse them from all guilt.

Another problem centers about the possible violations of commutative justice that may have been involved. Many complicated problems could occur, but I shall consider only those most publicized. In the first place, were the lucky contestants guilty of any act of injustice, which would now impose on them the obligation of restoring the money they won? We are considering now the case of a contestant who was given the answers beforehand with the knowledge and connivance of those furnishing the money to the winners. We are not now considering a contest in which there are other contenders—the star performer is the only one answering the questions. It would seem that no restitution is demanded by the laws of justice. It is true, he entered into a *contractus turpis* (a sinful contract) but he fulfilled what was required of him, and the principle governing such a case is that one who received money for an evil deed may probably keep the money, after he has performed the deed in question. Of course, he should have refused to perform the deed even after accepting the money and have returned the money. But *post factum,* he may retain it, according to a solidly probable opinion.

A more difficult case would arise if two contestants were pitted against each other. Of course, if both knew that the show was "rigged" and each realized that after a time one would be eliminated and the other would win (because the former would receive no help or would be tricked into a false answer and the other would be given the correct answer), again no restitution would have to be given to the loser by the winner or by the sponsor (or the producer, if he had the right to distribute the funds). In such a case, all the parties concerned were aware of what was to happen and apparently gave their consent to the procedure.

Still more difficult would be the case if the loser had not been told about the "rigging" and entered the contest believing it would be perfectly honest. In such a case it would seem that he has a right to some restitution, the amount being determined according to his chance of winning if the show had been honest. It is indeed difficult to compute such an amount; nevertheless, some of the winner's gain should be given to the loser. It should be added that an honest and unsuspecting loser in a "rigged" show would be justified in bringing a lawsuit against those who brought about his failure, on the ground that embarrassment and chagrin resulted from the fraud.

It would seem that in some instances applicants for a chance in a quiz show were told that they would be admitted only if they paid a bribe to the person choosing the contestants—a sum of money which presumably this official then pocketed. Of course, the one demanding the bribe may not keep a cent of it, for it was extortion money. But, to whom is restitution to be made? I believe that the problem is to be settled by the same principles that we use in the case of a judge who has accepted a bribe to favor one side in a litigation. If as a result of the bribe he renders a favorable judgment for the party who really is in the right, he must restore the money, because he is being paid twice for the same task (his salary and the bribe). If he renders a decision in favor of the undeserving party, he must make restitution to the party he has injured (or induce the winner to give up his unjust gain for this purpose). Similarly, the television official who for a bribe admits an applicant to a quiz show after this latter demonstrated that he was worthy of the appointment is bound to restore the bribe, because he is being paid to choose worthy candidates. If he passed over a deserving candidate in favor of one less competent, as a result of

a bribe, he must see to it that the person not selected is recompensed in accordance with the amount which he probably would have won—a very difficult amount to determine. If the winner of the contest will not make such recompense (which he should do because he profited by a dishonest transaction), the official must do so.

Another difficult factor in determining the amount of restitution demanded by the laws of justice is the fact that a good portion of the winning money may have been given to the government in taxes. Since, however, this would presumably have to be done in any event, whoever possessed the money, the net profit to the unjust winner would be the basic sum on which the restitution is to be computed.

The findings of the investigating committees have revealed in the television industry a most deplorable condition. However, this particular phase of dishonesty is only one part of a widespread state of deception in our country. Lies and dishonesty permeate our American society in every sphere—domestic, industrial, professional and political. Lies have become a national practice, from the mother who tells the train conductor that her fourteen-year-old son is only twelve, so that he can travel on half fare, to the statesman who lies his way into political office and prestige. Particularly, when some money can be gained, people seem willing to resort to any form of deception. The District Attorney of New York recently asserted in connection with the television investigation that of 150 persons who gave testimony before the board "maybe fifty told the truth" (*N.Y. Times,* Nov. 6, 1959). And some of these lies were perjuries—mortal sins, however unimportant the facts concerned. This spirit of deception is being communicated to children, by example and sometimes by direct advice from their elders—even from their parents. With such conditions prevailing, how can we be surprised if we raise a generation of liars?

Priests should warn their people frequently of the sinfulness of lying. They should let them know that a deliberate lie is a sin. It may be a venial sin or a mortal sin, depending on the circumstances and the effects. Even when it is not in itself grave, a lie can have very serious consequences, by its tendency to break down the moral stamina of our people. Catholics, above all, should be truthful and honest, even when they will thereby lose some temporal advantage which they could gain by deception.

It may be that the recent investigations on "rigged" television shows will be extended to other objectionable features of TV, such as deceptive advertising and obscene shows. If such results will follow from the investigations, television in our land may become what it should be—an effective means of promoting sound education, true culture and clean entertainment.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

FIFTY YEARS AGO

The leading article in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* for January, 1910, by Fr. J. B. Ceulemans, of Moline, Illinois, is entitled "The Newest Philosophy." It is a critical analysis of a work by Hugo Munsterberg, entitled *The Eternal Values.* According to the teaching of Mr. Munsterberg, there is no such thing as absolute truth. For example, in regard to moral obligation he states: "Self-faithfulness, self-loyalty is the only moral obligation.". . . Bishop Alexander MacDonald, of Victoria, writes on Extreme Unction. He defends the opinion that the proper end of this sacrament is the spiritual healing of the soul with a view to its entrance into glory. . . . Fr. V. F. O'Daniel, O.P., contributes an article on "St. Thomas Aquinas as a Preacher." He informs us that, although there are sermon outlines composed by the Angelic Doctor, "probably not one of St. Thomas's sermons is extant today as it was spoken." The author regrets that we have no copy of the discourse on the Blessed Sacrament which history tells us St. Thomas preached at the command of Pope Urban IV in the presence of the Pontiff and his Cardinals. . . . Fr. M. Martin, S.J., continues his series on the various Congregations, Tribunals and Offices of the Holy See. The present article is concerned with the Sacred Penitentiary. . . . The final chapters of Canon Sheehan's clerical novel, *The Blindness of the Reverend Doctor Gray,* appear in this issue. . . . A letter in the Studies and Conferences section appeals for a petition to the Holy See to obtain some mitigation of the rules of the eucharistic fast. The writer asserts that the number of Communions at the 9 o'clock Mass in Lent would be much greater if Catholics "were allowed to take their cup of coffee before Mass instead of after it." (The great heart of Pope Pius XII generously answered this petition in his decrees of 1953 and 1957.) . . . In this same section it is stated that an *oratio imperata* does not continue in force after a bishop's death or transfer, unless renewed by his successor, although the administrator has the right to order an *Imperata* for a special cause.

F. J. C.

Book Reviews

THE FIRST JESUIT. By Mary Purcell. Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1957. Pp. 417. $5.00.

This life of St. Ignatius Loyola should be popular for some time to come, for it is both scholarly and delightful.

Many people think of Ignatius as the stern-visaged founder of the Society of Jesus and its systematic letter-writing General who spread and governed a great organization throughout the world. Non-Catholic biographers have, at times, looked upon him as an intriguing man of the "power-play," overlooking the secret of his genius in his complete dedication to the single aim of the greater glory of God.

For Ignatius was not only an individual and saint whose life interests us for its own sake. He was the founder of a world-wide religious Order of historical importance and present significance, with the result that his biographers, friendly or unfriendly, have often portrayed him as the symbol of a "cause."

Even some of his early Jesuit biographers, living in the age of the pre-psychological "edifying" biography, did not feel free to indulge in uninhibited studies of the "human" side of their Founder and late religious Superior.

By returning to the innocently frank and bright reports of Pedro Ribadeneira, augmented by additional correspondence and other research material, and by by-passing the *cloisonné* tradition inaugurated by Maffei, Miss Purcell aims to bring Ignatius to life as the man and saint he was, and not so much as a founder, organizer, superior, leader in the Counter-Reformation.

Many of the intimate details of Ignatius' life as man and saint were, no doubt, lost with his almost complete burning of his spiritual diaries. The sources for an intimate biography of Ignatius are, as a result, somewhat jejune. But thanks to her feminine interest and persistence, and her wide and intensive research, Miss Purcell does manage to give us a richer-than-heretofore picture of Ignatius at closer range.

She comes pretty close to the real Ignatius, I suspect, when she writes: "Smiles and laughter seemed to come to him as readily as tears, and joy welled up in him at the sight of the Fathers, so much so that *he had trouble in preserving the serious demeanor he himself had laid*

down in the Constitutions; sometimes a smile or laugh escaped his lips in spite of his self-control . . ." (p. 340. Italics mine).

Her analysis of the temperament of Ignatius seems thoroughly borne out in her delineation of him in his youth and adulthood, before he became an administrator. The story of his youth and soldiering days, moreover, shows that Ignatius was *muy hombre!*

Miss Purcell's work is to be recommended for many excellences. One, in particular, is the light she throws on the pilgrimage of Ignatius to the Holy Land, through the skillful use of diaries kept by two of his fellow-pilgrims.

It should be mentioned, however, to keep a minor mistake from being perpetuated, that as the Ignatian scholar William J. Young, S.J., demonstrates in the *Review for Religious* (16:366-369, Nov. '57), the sources Miss Purcell uses do not warrant the conclusion that Ignatius had red hair and that he was "only barely five feet tall."

EUGENE B. GALLAGHER, S.J.

ELEMENTARY PATRCLOGY. By Aloys Dirksen, C.PP.S. St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1959. Pp. 314. $4.00.

Long the orphan among the branches of theology, patrology is at last coming into its own, and this new volume will speed its arrival. It gives the reader a brief, panoramic view of the lives and writings of the Greek and Latin Fathers of the Church. Seeking to keep the book on a simple plane, the author has encumbered it with neither footnotes nor bibliographical references, and has used foreign language quotations sparingly.

Just as in home life the father is the mainstay and a person to be venerated, so in the life of the Church the "Fathers" were the leaders and teachers of the early communities. Those Fathers whose writings were pre-eminent and guaranteed by the teaching authority of the Church were given the title "doctor." Such were Sts. Basil, Gregory of Nazianzen, and Chrysostom in the East; Sts. Hilary, Ambrose, and Augustine in the West. Eusebius and St. Jerome were the first historians of patrology. They wrote to refute pagan ridicule of Christian literature.

The plan of the work falls naturally into two divisions: the first section details the main currents of patristic literature and includes a survey of the most important writings. The second part is intended as a tool of ready reference with a compilation of the names and items in the writings of the Fathers not discussed in the first part. An appendix provides a handy listing and appraisal of the lesser heresies of the early Church.

This book is the product of many years spent in the study and teaching of patrology. It will benefit not only students in seminaries and universities but will be very helpful to priests and religious. Most priests candidly admit that patristic literature is a closed book to them—except for excerpts found in the breviary or in works of spirituality. *Elementary Patrology* will guide them easily to a better appreciation of the contributions of the pioneers in Christian theology.

The author is a Scriptural scholar of distinction and is noted for the painstaking and thorough character of all his work. If a general index were prepared for the next edition, it would increase still further the usefulness of this book. We heartily recommend *Elementary Patrology* for the seminarian, priest and general reader, and hope that it receives the wide circulation which it richly merits.

JOHN A. O'BRIEN

PLANNING FOR THE FORMATION OF SISTERS. Edited by Sister Ritamary, C.H.M. New York: Fordham University Press, 1958. Pp. 314. $3.00.

The 75th anniversary of the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore, which drafted the Magna Charta of American Catholic education, marks both an end and a beginning in Catholic education. Since that time the Church has come of age in America and has had a chance to test its strength against the challenges of excellence and extensiveness established by the Council. New educational problems demand new and intelligent decisions in harmony with the principles of the Council. If one book had to be selected to implement these decisions, my choice would be *Planning for the Formation of Sisters* since, in the process of analyzing the role of the Sisters in Catholic education, the book assembles the raw material relevant to most of the needs and educational decisions facing the Church.

Any analysis of challenges must be correlated with an analysis of resources. A scanning of the top line of the *Catholic Directory* reveals that our teaching personnel consists of 4506 brothers, 11,349 priests and scholastics, 43,745 lay teachers, and 96,516 sisters. This educational force is currently educating approximately 60% of the Catholic grammar school pupils, 40% of the high school students, and 30% of the Catholic college and university students. Against this realistic background the introductory essays of this volume show the continuing and deepening awareness of the need for a solid intellectual and spiritual training to prepare the sisters for their apostolate in education. Cardinal Cushing, Bishop Gill, Bishop Scully, Bishop Waters, Monsignor Voight, Father

Davis, and other educational leaders underscore the fact that the excellence of our educational apostolate will be in direct proportion to the excellence of our teacher formation, and the sisters represent 60% of all Catholic school teachers.

The heart of this book is the lengthy and complete (128 pages) article on *Sister Teachers in the United States* which is an abridgement of a doctoral thesis by Sister Rose Matthew. The information is exhaustive and objective, the charts and diagrams (125 of them) are clear, the conclusions are balanced and challenging. Although our age is rapidly being forced to an immunity to statistics, no Catholic concerned about education can afford to ignore the implications of this overview of our educational resources. The survey covers all levels of education and also presents regional findings. There are any number of valuable statistics. Sisters' schools represent 70% of all Catholic education below the college level and 76% of the sisters teach in elementary schools while 20% teach in secondary schools. By projecting the present rates of increase among sisters and lay teachers, the present ratio of 97,000 sisters and 38,000 lay teachers in sisters' schools will jump to 109,000 to 72,000 by 1965, and by 1971 the lay teachers will outnumber the sisters by 137,000 to 121,000. At present, 37% of the teaching sisters do not have a college degree. Statistics of this kind merit consideration at the prie-dieu as well as at the conference table.

In the two following chapters, Sister Elizabeth Ann treats of the revenue sources in parochial school expansion and of the in-service needs of the teaching sister. This second article reports the findings of a questionnaire answered by 6500 teaching sisters in both the elementary and secondary schools. At both levels the teachers felt that to meet adequate standards they needed twelve more hours of time a week for preparation.

The factual groundwork presented by this book and the choices involved find their application at all levels of Catholic education—national, diocesan and parochial. Vision and insight cannot be the luxury of the few since every grassroots decision affects the future pattern of Catholic education. It seems clear now that we cannot do everything in education, and that every choice and commitment to one level of education may implicitly involve a rejection of the other levels. We shape our decisions and thereafter they shape us. Since the sisters represent our priority resource, it is imperative that their training prepare them for deployment at all levels of Catholic education. Anyone concerned about Catholic education, intellectualism, vocations, and leadership should be heartened by the high standards and hard work which the sisters have plotted out for themselves.

In future writings it is hoped that more will be said about television and other electronic aids, part-time teachers' aides, and the reshuffling of class sizes and arrangements, since future education cannot survive at a quality level by merely duplicating current procedures. But for now, in this time of grace before the full impact of the population explosion, of technological advances, and of social change is upon us, Catholic education should be grateful that the sisters are at such pains to put at the service of the Church a corps of professional and apostolic teachers equal to the challenges of their educational mandate.

JOHN M. CULKIN, S.J.

LITURGICAL RETREAT. By Roy J. Howard, S.J. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1959. Pp. xii + 145. $3.00.

This is an excellent book. There is only one source of complaint: there is not enough. The title, *Liturgical Retreat,* calls for an observation. It does not mean that retreats of old utterly ignored the liturgy. Nor does it mean that the themes usually associated with a retreat are missing from this book. Father Howard has utilized the main themes from the Ignation exercises and used the liturgy as his source for explaining and developing them. In this way there is a happy union of the retreat movement and the liturgical movement.

Father Howard concentrates on the liturgy of baptism, confirmation, and the Eucharist. The three sacraments form a unity; they comprise what is known as the three sacraments of initiation. It was around these that many of the Fathers, e.g., Sts. Cyril of Jerusalem, Ambrose of Milan, Augustine of Hippo, and Zeno of Verona, wrote some of their most inspiring writings. The present book is their twentieth century echo and continuation. With the liturgy and theology of these sacraments as his starting point, he shows who the Christian is and how he can renew and rededicate his life in view of the transforming force that is his. The result is a series of talks that are fresh and refreshing, new and renewing, vigorous and invigorating.

A sound, balanced liturgical life that follows the ideals, directives, and encouragement of Rome is of vital importance for both the clergy and laity. This book will be of immense help in this direction. Perhaps, in time (to quell the complaint of this reviewer that there was not enough of this excellent book), Father Howard will go on to give us further retreat talks based on the liturgy of the other sacraments.

ALFRED C. RUSH, C.SS.R.

STUDIA IN HONOREM FRANCISCI ROBERTI, J. B. MONTINI, H. J. CICOGNANI: S. R. E. CARDINALIUM (*Apollinaris*, XXXII, Fasc. I-II). Vatican City: Pontifical University of the Lateran, 1959. Pp. 302.

This special issue of the canonical review *Apollinaris* is dedicated to three former professors at the Pontifical Institute *Utriusque Iuris* of Rome who were recently elevated to the cardinalate: Cardinal Roberti (who taught procedural and penal law), Cardinal Montini (ecclesiastical diplomacy), and Cardinal Cicognani (introduction and general norms).

The figure of each cardinal is perceptively delineated against the backdrop of his scholastic and priestly activities. Even though already acquainted with these men's qualities and achievements, the reader cannot fail to feel again the impact of their greatness. One looks almost in wonder at the Church wisdom that was responsible for their thorough training and ecumenic formation. One is proud of belonging to a society that produces and is governed by such outstanding leaders—the true *aristoi* in a world-wide community where so many are good and great.

The articles contained in this special issue were written by former pupils of the honored Cardinals. While they are all worth reading, this reviewer was particularly impressed by the following studies: Lefebvre's observations on the authority of the Oriental Code for the interpretation of the *Codex Iuris Canonici;* Bender's pointed discussion on whether the baptized man spoken of in Canon 87 should be properly called a *persona in Ecclesia* or a *membrum in Ecclesia;* Felici's timely remarks on psychological investigation in the solution of cases before the ecclesiastical court; Cassola's sound suggestions about the revision of penal law in the Church; D'Ercole's scholarly analysis of the internal forum and the external forum in the penitential discipline during the first Christian centuries; Goyeneche's historical excursus on the Cardinals' right of precedence (from the Renaissance period to the present day) both in Church law and custom and in the law and usages of Catholic nations. A contribution that will please equally the jurist, the philosopher, and the theologian is *"De jure ut obiecto justitiae apud S. Thomam"* by Lio (pp. 16-71).

JOHN A. ABBO

FREEDOM OF CHOICE IN EDUCATION. By Virgil C. Blum, S.J. New York: MacMillan Co., 1958. Pp. xv + 230. $3.95.

The perennial charge that private schools are divisive, undemocratic, and needlessly reduplicate existing public facilities has understandably

annoyed many Americans. For the pompous monopolists of secular education who utter such charges ignore the obvious fact that private schools are in existence, precisely because their facilities are not reduplicated in the public system, and because they exercise a fundamental democratic right in supplementing the religious and academic inadequacies of public education with programs of their own.

Such critics will be horrified at the logic exhibited by Father Blum in this timely volume, not because there is anything wrong with the logic, but because of the heterodox thesis of Father Blum that the public school is not one of democracy's divinities. They will not be mollified either by the somewhat argumentative style employed by the author in the development of his case.

That case, competently argued, is completely in opposition to the unstated premise of the attackers, viz., that the public schools have the sole right to teach the nation's children.

As the book observes, freedom of choice, which is considered indispensable in every other area of democratic society, is considered suspect and divisive in democracy's most vital area of education. In other words "the public schools [are] the state established church expounding the religion of secularism to captive 'parishioners' at public expense."

The McCollum decision, by formally and legally ousting the positive religions of Catholicism, Protestantism, and Judaism by highly questionable legal inference, has precluded the possibility of perpetuating the religious convictions upon which this nation was established.

The author avoids the emotion-charged word, "godless," in speaking of the public schools, because like those who have attended public schools, he is no doubt aware that in actual practice spiritual values at least vaguely Christian in character have been imparted. But he is also aware that the public school is no longer the parochial school of Protestantism, which it had been in fact if not in theory for the past century, and that any spiritual values taught must be taught furtively in the future.

Compulsory conformity to a state-charted secularism, Father Blum claims, is not only inimical to any theistic philosophy of life; it is prejudicial to the Christian, totalitarian in theory, and monopolistic in practice. The law shows increasing evidence of being accommodated to a handful of pagans who are trying to read a retroactive secularism into our way of life.

It would be naïve in the extreme to suggest that the absence of any overt attack on religion in the schools constitutes neutrality. Neutrality in education is not merely difficult; it is impossible. To ignore religion

is to take a position on religion's value. To declare that religion is beyond the periphery of education is to assume the possibility of a secular culture devoid of moral and religious factors.

It would be equally naïve as well as insultingly patronizing to say that people are free to establish their own independent schools if preferential government aid to state schools creates unfair competition. Financial subsidy is not merely an aid to state schools; it is a competitive weapon, and a form of "economic coercion" against private education. As the author states: "When government enforces conformity to the philosophical and theological orientation of a particular school as a condition for sharing in educational benefits, it violates freedom of thought and freedom of religion."

It is rather significant to recall that not merely adventitious privileges but the basic rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness were regarded by the Founding Fathers as God-given. Yet the public school, which is the very instrument regarded by its perfervid enthusiasts as the sole means of communicating our heritage, is forbidden to communicate information about the truths on which our principles are based. This is defended by reference to Justice Black's strange opinion that aid to *all* creeds as well as preferential treatment of *one* creed is constitutionally forbidden.

Father Blum sees in this court-sanctioned secularism a basically undemocratic force destructive of freedom and conducive to educational mediocrity. He suggests that government should limit its role in education by permitting the individual student, with a certificate of money value, "complete freedom of choice in purchasing his schooling in the market place of education."

The so-called certificate or voucher plan, or a modified tax-credit plan, not only has a precedent in the veterans' educational program following World War II, but in programs of a similar nature undertaken in France and Great Britain. The author suggests that not only is this system inherently democratic, but it avoids problems of constitutionality, and focuses attention on the fact that government obligation is to children, not to systems.

Father Blum suggests that otherwise believers and their children actually become second-class citizens, deprived of public protection against dangers of traffic and the hazards of traveling long distance to school in fulfillment of compulsory education laws.

The chief benefits of the program the author advocates are: the creation of a true freedom of choice within a constitutional framework; new opportunities for the gifted student through increased specialization; the preservation of voluntary associations in the field of educa-

tion; the maintenance of competition, diversity and free enterprise in education.

The sole objection the reviewer would make to this highly recommended and stimulating book would be to question the claim that substantial savings would result for the taxpayer. The Green-Gauerke report would seem to suggest that costs would soar in the establishment of a network of private schools. It is to be hoped that the author will develop this point of financial feasibility, in subsequent treatment, as he is obviously conversant with the problems of which he speaks so forcibly—and so well.

ROBERT PAUL MOHAN, S.S.

THE SPIRITANS. A HISTORY OF THE CONGREGATION OF THE HOLY GHOST. By Henry J. Koren, C.S.Sp. (Spiritan Studies, No. 1). Pittsburgh: Duquesne University, 1958. Pp. xxix + 641. $5.75 (paper). $6.50 (cloth).

This history of the Spiritans is divided into two parts. The first part, the general history, is chronological and traces the history from its founding in 1703 down to the present. Here one reads of the founder, Father Poullart des Places, the struggle of the early days, the work of the Congregation against Jansenism and the tragic days of the French Revolution. The difficult days of the restoration after the revolution are recounted and then we learn of the entrance of Father Liebermann, an event that put new life into the Congregation and put it on a sure footing. From here on the chapters are devoted to the work of the Congregation under the various Generals.

The second part is geographical and is entitled: "The Holy Ghost Fathers Throughout the World." Here we see the work of the Congregation in Europe, North America, the West Indies, South America, Indian Ocean, Australia, and Africa. While all this work is important, readers in this country will be especially interested in the account of the United States. At the same time, the work in Africa should be singled out, by reason of the fact that they were pioneers in the systematic evangelization of Africa.

This is a work of first rate historical scholarship. The abundant bibliography shows this, as well as the text itself. One only writes this way by a deep study of the sources. In citing, the author has recourse to marginal symbols, to indicate in brief form the copious entries of the bibliography. The author who writes first-rate history also tells an interesting story. It is a pleasure to meet profound scholarship and interesting writing united.

Father Koren has written a history of his Congregation that is objective, impartial. Praise and blame are meted out as called for. It truly is an unbiased study of 250 years of history. He has also struck a happy balance in handling the internal and external history of the Congregation, and in doing justice to its various fields of endeavor, missions, teaching, and parishes. A study like this is not only a history of the Congregation, it is also a study in part of the history of the Church. It is under the Church that this work is carried on, and it is by the Church that this work is entrusted to it. In the sphere of the impact of the Congregation on the Church, there is one point that this reviewer wished were handled at greater length, and that is the struggle of the Spiritans against Jansenism.

Many interesting pictures and charts as well as an index of names and a topical index are found in this excellently printed book. The first volume of the series, *The Spiritans,* is a success; it is also a tribute to Father Koren, the Congregation of the Holy Ghost, and Duquesne University.

ALFRED C. RUSH, C.SS.R.

THE SCOPE AND NATURE OF UNIVERSITY EDUCATION. By John Henry Cardinal Newman. A Dutton Everyman Paperback: New York, 1958. Pp. xli + 237. $1.25.

The present Dutton edition seems modelled on the eight-essay plan of the 1859 edition of the same name; the 1852 edition contained an additional, the fifth, essay (an important one, on the unity of knowledge) and two opening essays which in 1859 were combined into one. Dutton has bracketed these eight 1859 essays with the long rambling introduction of Wilfred Ward, and the especially important "Christianity and Scientific Investigation" from the second part of the 1873 *Idea of a University.*

Newman's argument for deepening a university education with a thorough-going department of Theology is, superficially, that a University by its very name is obliged to maintain all branches of knowledge. It is, profoundly, that questions about freedom, conscience, destiny, order, sanction, dependence, wisdom must be treated somewhere *ex professo,* or the whole body of knowledge is walking on air and running from reality. The key word Newman uses to describe what a University should be is "intercommunion" (v.g., p. 210): an intercommunion based on mutual respect and order. No one insists that Newman wished the mere *presence* of a theology department on campus, least of all a department retired from creative thinking and modern complexity.

A particularly valuable page or two are on the liberty needed by the scientific investigator: "It is a matter of primary importance . . . that the investigator should be free, independent, unshackled in his movements; that he should be allowed and enabled, without impediment, to fix his mind intently, nay exclusively, on his special object, without the risk of being distracted every other minute in the process and progress of his inquiry by the charges of temerariousness, or by warnings against extravagance or scandal" (pp. 222 f.).

But with great delicacy Newman also sets the lines of discipline upon this liberty. (1) Apparent collisions with the data of natural law or Revelation are inevitable, but time and intelligence will arbitrate the apparencies and restore even to our finite vision the unity of truth (pp. 217 ff.). (2) Still, the investigator ought not go beyond his data to pronounce, himself, conclusions on Scripture or religion; his task is discovery and discussion, not pronouncement (p. 223). (3) The investigator as teacher ought not to advertise his advanced and ambitious theories at random, or play at prophesying before captive and unformed minds (p. 224). (4) The investigator ought to be wary of unsettling the popular mind, which often cannot discriminate the limits of revolutionary discoveries (p. 224). These may be summed up in the reverence and gravity due the truth, along with liberty.

Dutton is to be commended for the present edition. The large-margined layout of the Everyman books is comfortable, and handy for making notes; the quality of paper is restful to the eye—an advance in paperback artistry.

MICHAEL NOVAK, C.S.C.

Books Received

VATICAN DIPLOMACY. A STUDY OF CHURCH AND STATE ON THE INTERNATIONAL PLANE. By Robert A. Graham, S.J. Princeton, N. J.: Princeton University Press, 1959. Pp. xii + 442. $7.50.

FATHER MCGEE. By J. William McKune. Saint Meinrad, Ind.: Grail Publications, 1959. Pp. ix + 198. $3.50.

WE ARE NOW CATHOLICS. By Rudolf Goethe, Heinrich Schlier, Georg Klünder, and Martin Giebner. Edited by Karl Hardt, S.J. Translated from the German by Norman C. Reeves. With an Introductory Essay by Sylvester P. Theisen. Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press, 1959. Pp. vii + 223. $3.95.

THE SOCIAL ORDER OF TOMORROW. STATE AND SOCIETY IN THE ATOMIC AGE. By Otto von Habsburg. Foreword by Christopher Hollis. Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press, 1959. Pp. 158. $2.75.

THE LIVING PARISH. By Leo R. Ward, C.S.C. Notre Dame, Ind.: Fides Publishers Association, 1959. Pp. xvi + 191. $3.95.

ONE FOLD. ESSAYS AND DOCUMENTS TO COMMEMORATE THE GOLDEN JUBILEE OF THE CHAIR OF UNITY OCTAVE. Edited by Edward F. Hanahoe, S.A., and Titus F. Cranny, S.A. Graymoor, Garrison, N. Y.: Chair of Unity Apostolate, 1959. Pp. 384. $6.50.

DIO NEL MONDO E NELL'UOMO. By Msgr. Antonio Piolanti. Rome: Desclée & C., 1959. Pp. xii + 853. No price given.

THE TOMBS OF ST. PETER & ST. PAUL. By Engelbert Kirschbaum, S.J. Translated from the German by John Murray, S.J. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1959. Pp. 247. $7.50.

PRAY, SISTER. PRIE-DIEU THOUGHTS FOR NUNS. By John E. Moffatt, S.J. New York: McMullen Books, Inc., 1959. Pp. 172. $3.75.

CONFERENCES ON THE BEATITUDES. By Louis A. Rongione, O.S.A. Philadelphia: The Peter Reilly Co., 1959. Pp. 175. $2.75.

AMERICAN CATHOLICS. A PROTESTANT-JEWISH VIEW. By Stringfellow Barr, Robert McAfee Brown, Arthur Cohen, Rabbi Arthur Gilbert, Martin Marty, and Allyn Robinson. With an Afterword

by Gustave Weigel, S.J. Edited by Philip Scharper. New York: Sheed & Ward, 1959. Pp. 235. $3.75.

FATHER CONNELL ANSWERS MORAL QUESTIONS. By Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R. Edited by Eugene J. Weitzel, C.S.V. Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1959. Pp. xii + 210. $3.95.

WHERE SOMEBODY CARES. THE MARY MANNING WALSH HOME AND ITS PROGRAM FOR COMPLETE CARE OF THE AGING: A DESCRIPTIVE ACCOUNT OF MODERN CONCEPTS IN ACTION. By Mother Bernadette de Lourdes, O.Carm., and the Staff of the Mary Manning Walsh Home. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1959. Pp. 252. $5.00.

SAINT DOMINIC. By Sister Mary Jean Dorcy, O.P. St. Louis and London: B. Herder Book Co., 1959. Pp. xi + 173. $3.25. This is n. 15 of the *Cross and Crown Series of Spirituality*.

THE PROPHETS OF ISRAEL. By C. Ross Milley, Ph.D. New York: Philosophical Library, 1959. Pp. ix + 143. $3.75.

PROVING GOD: A NEW APOLOGETIC. By R. A. Knox. With a Preface by Evelyn Waugh. London: The Month, 1959. Pp. 52. 3 shillings.

HAMMER AND FIRE: TOWARD DIVINE HAPPINESS AND MENTAL HEALTH. By M. Raphael Simon, O.C.S.O., M.D. New York: P. J. Kenedy & Sons, 1959. Pp. xii + 258. $3.95.

AND GOD MADE MAN AND WOMAN: A FACTUAL DISCUSSION OF SEX DIFFERENCES. By Lucius F. Cervantes, S.J. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1959. Pp. xi + 275. $4.00.

FAITH IS THE SUBSTANCE. THE LIFE OF MOTHER THEODORE GUERIN, FOUNDRESS OF THE SISTERS OF PROVIDENCE OF SAINT MARY-OF-THE-WOODS, INDIANA. By Katherine Burton. St. Louis and London: B. Herder Book Co., 1959. Pp. xi + 260. $4.50.

MARY, MOTHER OF FAITH. By Josef Weiger. Translated by Ruth Mary Bethell, with a special Introduction to the English Translation by Msgr. Romano Guardini. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company, 1959. Pp. 260. $5.00.